THE U.S. ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 27 AND OCTOBER 3, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
32-616 O WASHINGTON : 1984

THE U.S. ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 27 AND OCTOBER 3, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
32-616 O WASHINGTON : 1984

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DON BONKER, Washington
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
ANDY IRELAND, Florida
DAN MICA, Florida
MICHAEL D. BARNES, Maryland
HOWARD WOLPE, Michigan
GEO. W. CROCKETT, Jr., Michigan
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
TOM LANTOS, California
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT G. TORRICELLI, New Jersey
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
HARRY M. REID, Nevada
MEL LEVINE, California
EDWARD F. FEIGHAN, Ohio
TED WEISS, New York
ROBERT GARCIA, New York

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
LARRY WINN, Jr., Kansas
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
JOEL PRITCHARD, Washington
JIM LEACH, Iowa
TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois
GERALD B. H. SOLOMON, New York
DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER, Nebraska
MARK D. SILJANDER, Michigan
ED ZSCHAU, California

John J. Brady, Jr., *Chief of Staff*
Shirley Dawson, *Staff Assistant*

Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations

GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

DON BONKER, Washington
MEL LEVINE, California
TED WEISS, New York
TOM LANTOS, California
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, Pennsylvania

JIM LEACH, Iowa
ED ZSCHAU, California
GERALD B. H. SOLOMON, New York

Robert Michael Finley, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
Cynthia D. Sprunger, *Minority Staff Consultant*
Mark J. Tavlarides, *Subcommittee Staff Consultant*
Bernadette Paolo, *Subcommittee Staff Consultant*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

	Page
September 27, 1983:	
Hon. Nancy Landon Kassebaum, a U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas	4
Hon. Elliot L. Richardson, president, United Nations Association of the United States of America (UNA-USA), and former Under Secretary of State, accompanied by Steven A. Dimoff, director, Washington office	19
October 3, 1983:	
Hon. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations	51

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Report dated September 19, 1983, prepared by UNA-USA entitled "U.N. Still Wins Approval of Most Americans, Roper Poll Reports"	23
Background paper prepared by UNA-USA, September 1983, entitled "Directions for the U.N.: U.S. Public Opinion on the United Nations"	25

APPENDIXES

1. The Kassebaum amendment on restriction on assessed payments to the United Nations, as recorded in the Congressional Record of September 23, 1983	85
2. Letter dated October 1, 1983, from Kenneth W. Dam, Acting Secretary, to Representative Yatron regarding the administration's position on the Kassebaum amendment	86
3. Press release dated September 19, 1983, by the U.S. mission to the United Nations regarding Ambassador Lichenstein's remarks	87
4. Remarks of President Reagan to regional editors and broadcasters on September 21, 1983, regarding Ambassador Lichenstein's remarks on the United Nations leaving the United States	88
5. Comparison of U.N. and U.S. civil service salaries and take-home pay, submitted by Ambassador Kirkpatrick	89
6. Letter from Representative Yatron to Ambassador Kirkpatrick submitting questions for the record concerning the United Nations and Africa	90
7. Questions submitted to Ambassador Kirkpatrick by Subcommittee Chairman Yatron and responses thereto	91
8. Report prepared by the U.N. Information Center entitled "Summary of Benefits and Achievements of the United Nations System"	93
9. Text of President Reagan's September 25, 1983, speech at a reception for the heads of delegations to the 38th General Assembly	96
10. President Reagan's September 26, 1983, speech to the 38th session of the U.N. General Assembly	98

THE U.S. ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1983

House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Subcommittee on Human Rights and
International Organizations,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2:30 p.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Gus Yatron (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. Yatron. The subcommittee will come to order.

For almost 40 years vigorous U.S. participation in the United Nations and its specialized agencies has been a major focus of our foreign policy under eight Presidents, including President Reagan.

Within the last week three separate events have raised a serious question about the steadfastness of America's commitment to the United Nations.

First, a Deputy U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations in a heated moment suggested that the United States might be happy to have the United Nations leave the United States. He stated that if the United Nations wished to leave he would be on hand at the dock to bid a fond farewell. Some of my colleagues in Congress have expressed outrage, but others, accustomed to certain rhetorical excesses, were prepared to forgive and forget.

But then President Reagan undid the best efforts of official spokesmen by stating his belief that most Americans approved the sentiments of Ambassador Lichtenstein. This left some wondering whether the President really endorsed the idea of inviting the United Nations to leave.

Finally, at the end of last week, by an overwhelming vote, the Senate unexpectedly adopted an amendment sharply reducing funds authorized to pay the assessed U.S. contribution to the United Nations, UNESCO, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization.

For a generation, American politics has heard the cry "Get the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States." What had been viewed as a radical slogan has overnight apparently become a distinct possibility.

To examine the implications of these events for U.S. foreign policy and U.S. participation in the United Nations, the subcommittee has scheduled today's hearing. At the invitation of the subcommittee, the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, the Honorable Jeane J. Kirkpatrick has agreed to testify

next Monday, October 3, at 3 p.m., on the issues which prompted this hearing. We look forward to hearing her testimony at that time.

I would like to yield to Mr. Leach, the subcommittee's ranking minority member, for an opening statement.

Mr. LEACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to begin by noting that seldom in my years in public office have I been more upset at the needless diatribe that has been sparked by representatives of the U.S. Government. Incredibly, our representatives at the United Nations have reestablished debate about the legitimacy of that body, and also about the conceivable possibility that maybe the United States would be better off with the United Nations out of the United States, and perhaps with the United States out of the United Nations.

I think a fair question to be asked at this time, is where is statesmanship? The duty of leadership is to appeal to the highest, not the lowest, instincts in American public life. This is, frankly, not a time to play cheap word games about the desirability of having the United Nations being represented half the time in Moscow. All of us who have ever served at the United Nations or observed the United Nations recognize that it has some shortcomings.

Even the Secretary General's latest annual report expresses deep concern over—and I quote—the "partial paralysis of the United Nations as the guardian of international peace and security." The Secretary General noted the various regional situations with grave potential implications for international peace such as Southeast Asia, Afghanistan, Chad, Iran, Lebanon, and Central America. He pointed to the institution's failure to achieve progress in arms control, human rights, and global poverty.

On the other hand, the United Nations has been distinctly significant in its achievements in a number of ways. It was effective in dealing with the crisis in the Congo in 1960 to 1964, and in the Sinai in 1973, where peacekeeping operations may have helped to prevent a United States-Soviet confrontation.

Yesterday the President of the United States stated, and I would like to quote him:

> We give our unwavering support to the peacekeeping efforts of this body, as well as other multilateral peacekeeping efforts around the world. The United Nations has a proud history of promoting conciliation and helping keep the peace. Today U.N. peacekeeping forces or observers are present in Cyprus and Kashmir, on the Golan Heights and in Lebanon.[1]

It should also be stressed the United Nations has assisted refugees, with the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees receiving the Nobel Peace Prize. The World Health Organization has helped to eradicate smallpox, and UNICEF has worked hard to better the lives of children and to insure their survival. The United Nations also helped to initiate the historical Law of the Sea Conference that led to the finalization of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, which one of our witnesses worked so constructively to advance.

The United Nations has also been active in the area of agricultural development, hunger, population control, and nuclear prolif-

---

[1] See appendix 9 for full text of speech.

eration. Here it should be stressed that when we look at the issue of arms control it is not simply a matter of United States-Soviet concern; there are many issues that will demand multilateral responses and multilateral restraint.

For the United States to question the United Nations in its efforts in this area is deeply troubling. I think as a society we should not shrink from asserting that we are proud of the United Nations and proud that the United Nations is located in the United States of America. There should be no doubt that the United States is committed to the United Nations.

Here let me quote again from the speech of the President of the United States to the United Nations yesterday. President Reagan said, and I quote:

"I solemnly pledge my Nation to upholding the original ideals of the United Nations."

Efforts to denigrate the United Nations undermine the President's ability to uphold those ideals. Here, from a historical perspective, we should recall that the League of Nations failed in large measure because the United States stayed out. The failure of the League led, as we all know, at least in partial measure, to a Second World War. It is interesting in this regard to note that Pope John Paul II, as a moral spokesman for the world just recently commented that the world community in his judgment was moving from a postwar to a prewar mentality. I am not at all sure that some of the debates sparked in this country in the last week haven't vindicated that very troubling position of the Pope.

In essence, I think it is time that we sounded the alarm bells in support of the United Nations. It may be that the United States itself has less influence over that body than it had at the beginning of the United Nations in the immediate post-World War II era. But I think we should recognize it is more important to us now than then.

At the end of World War II, the United States represented about half the world's economic and military capacity. Today, and forever, we will never again attain that particular strategic and economic position. Hence international solutions to world problems are more, not less important at this time, and nothing is less responsible than to deprecate the United Nations and its sister organizations.

Those like Mayor Koch who enjoy heaping ridicule on the United Nations, calling it a cesspool, may find such pronouncements personally gratifying but I think it is at a great deal of cost to the national interest of the United States.

Speaking as a representative of the State of Iowa, I would stress that I know a lot of communities in my State that would enjoy nothing more than the infusion of half a billion dollars a year in income that the presence of the United Nations would generate if the institution were reestablished in their particular communities. In addition, I would stress from the point of view of Israel that there is nothing more important for the support and survival of Israel than arms control and the strengthening of international law, which the United Nations symbolizes although admittedly it has from time to time failed to do a very good job in advancing and upholding it.

Finally, let me stress that for those conservatives who demand that the United States get out of the United Nations, they must realize that going it alone may be psychologically satisfying but strategically, it is a prescription for disaster. Security in the 20th century is not self-willed, it is collective.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your giving me the chance to make an opening statement and I certainly welcome the witnesses we have.

Mr. YATRON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Now I would like to call on the gentleman from the State of Washington for an opening statement.

Mr. BONKER. No comment at this time, Mr. Chairman. I am anxious to hear the witnesses and ask some questions.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you.

Mr. Zschau.

Mr. ZSCHAU. No.

Mr. YATRON. Our first witness today is the Honorable Nancy Landon Kassebaum, U.S. Senator from Kansas.

Senator Kassebaum is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Last Thursday the full Senate by an overwhelming vote of 66 to 23, adopted her amendment to reduce the 1984 U.S.-assessed contribution to the United Nations, and certain specialized agencies, to the level of our 1980 contribution. Her amendment also reduces the U.S. contribution in subsequent years by 10 percent per year, until in 1987 it reaches 70 percent of the 1980 level.

Finally, her amendment provides that no contributions be made unless the United Nations accepts the reduced amount as the full U.S. payment.

Senator Kassebaum, we appreciate your seeking this opportunity to explain the thinking behind your amendment and your overall view of U.S. participation in the United Nations.

Senator, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be able to be here. I appreciate your inviting me to speak before the subcommittee on the matter of U.S. mandatory contributions to the United Nations, UNESCO, ILO, FAO, and WHO, the five U.N. organizations that assess the United States for 25 percent of their cost.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I certainly support your opening comment that the United Nations has been a strong force as an international forum. I strongly believe it should continue to be one.

I think that there could be a question of the timing of my amendment following on the heels of the other comments that have occurred and other events, but it is something that I have looked at for a couple of years, as have many others. When you talk about reducing our assessed contribution, people say "well, it can't be done." I think in reviewing the past history of my amendment—and this is what I would like to address for a moment—I felt it was an important time to do so as a member of the Budget

Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, my two interests combined.

Last Thursday, the Senate did vote, as you mentioned 66 to 23, to limit the U.S. contribution to these organizations for 1984 to the calendar year 1980 level, and specified that in each of the 3 succeeding years the dollar level of the U.S. contributions would be reduced by 10 percent.

By the end of the 4-year period, from 1984 through 1987, a savings of at least $484 million could be achieved. The amendment does not reduce U.S. voluntary contributions to organizations such as UNICEF, UNDP, and other development and relief organizations, and certainly that means the peacekeeping forces as well.

Much has been said and written since last week about the effect this amendment would have on the United Nations. Reaction has ranged from opinions this would be a positive step to a claim by one Senator that it would lead somehow to general war.

My own goal in offering this amendment is simple: I hope that we might cause the members of the United Nations to engage in some productive soul searching about an organization that can and must play a little role in international affairs. I would hope that this amendment would lead to new thoughts about priorities for and spending by the United Nations. In the process we might restore a measure of public confidence in the idea that the United Nations does indeed have a clear vision of a better, more peaceful future, and a firm plan on how to reach it.

I believe it is time to do something about the description of the United Nations offered by Senator Abe Ribicoff in 1977 when his Senate Government Operations Committee issued a scathing report on U.N. organizations.

The Senator said then, I believe with great accuracy, that "all too often the organizations headquartered in extravagant and luxurious surroundings are ineffective, top-heavy with high-paid officials, uncertain in their purposes, and unduly repetitious of other organizations."

Unfortunately, Senator Ribicoff's words could well be spoken today with no less accuracy.

As the balance of my written statement notes, there is nothing new about the concern expressed by my amendment nor do I believe that the amendment itself is a new or radical proposal to solve this perennial problem. If enacted into law, this amendment would simply assert the right of the Congress to determine spending from the U.S. Treasury. That is the constitutional right of the Congress. It is also our duty.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that the balance of my remarks, which are really just supporting figures and so forth, be made a matter of record, and I would be glad to respond to any questions.

Mr. YATRON. Without objection, they will be made part of the record.

[Senator Kassebaum's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for inviting me to speak before your subcommittee on the matter of U.S. mandatory contributions to the United Nations,

UNESCO, ILO, FAO, and WHO—the five UN organizations that assess the United States for 25 percent of their costs.

Last Thursday, the Senate voted 66 to 23 to limit the U.S. contribution to these organizations for 1984 to the calendar year 1980 level and specified that in each of three succeeding years the dollar level of U.S. contributions would be reduced by 10 percent. By the end of the four year period, calendar years 1984 through 1987, a savings of at least $484 million could be achieved. The amendment does not reduce U.S. voluntary contributions to organizations such as UNICEF, INDP, and other development and relief organizations.

Much has been said and written since last week about the effect this amendment would have on the United Nations. The reaction has ranged from opinions that this would be a positive step to a claim of one Senator that it would lead, somehow, to "general war."

My own goal in offering this amendment is simple: I hope that we might cause the members of the United Nations to engage in some productive soul searching about an organization that can—and must—play a vital role in international affairs. I would hope that this amendment would lead to new thoughts about priorities for and spending by the United Nations. In the process, we might restore a measure of public confidence in the idea that the United Nations does indeed have a clear vision of a better, more peaceful future and a firm plan on how to reach it.

I believe it is time to do something about the description of the United Nations offered by Senator Abraham Ribicoff in 1977, when his Senate Government Operations Committee issued a scathing report on UN organizations.

The Senator said then, with I believe great accuracy, that: "all too often the organizations headquartered in extravagant and luxurious surroundings are ineffective, top-heavy with high paid officials . . . uncertain in their purposes, and unduly repetitious of other organizations."

Unfortunately, Senator Ribicoff's words could well be spoken today with no less accuracy.

As the balance of my statement notes, there is nothing new about the concern expressed by my amendment. Nor do I believe that the amendment itself is a new or radical proposal to solve this perennial problem.

If enacted into law, this amendment would simply assert the right of the Congress to determine spending from the U.S. Treasury. That is the constitutional right of the Congress. It also is our duty.

United States mandatory contributions to UN agencies have soared over the past decade. A report by the House Committee on Appropriations last year noted that mandatory contributions in 1982 were 273 percent higher than that of a decade earlier. While some of this increase is attributable to the 115 percent inflation we experienced over that decade, most of the increase is due to program increases and uncontrolled spending. This increase took place despite the repeated executive branch assurances to the Congress and the American people that it was committed to bringing UN budgets under control.

President Johnson sought to control spending at the UN, ordering the U.S. representative to the UN to apply to the UN agencies "the same rigorous standards of program performance and budget review that we do to our federal programs."

In 1972, the State Department assured the Congress that UN budgets would "receive the same searching scrutiny that is applied to our own federal programs. Austerity is the guiding principle for federal expenditures. We must apply it equally to International Organizations." I do not question the sincerity of the State Department's commitment. However, they are not in the driver's seat when it comes to setting the UN budget.

The United States and other major donors have voted to contol UN budgets, but have been consistently outvoted by those nations whose total contributions do not exceed 2 percent of the total UN budget. On budgetary matters, those nations whose contributions are set at one one-hundredth of one percent have the same vote as the United States, which must contribute 25 percent.

Because of the lack of budgetary discipline, that UN has grown to 46,479 staff members, 17,000 in the UN secretariat alone.

Staff salaries are excessive. There is some difficulty in tracking down the exact salary levels since they are denominated in 1977 dollars with a "post adjustment allowance" that is, in fact, a cost of living supplement and there are numerous fringe benefits. If the information I have received is correct, the typical UN employee in New York takes home in salary, additional payments because of spouse and children, and education assistance payments for private schooling, over $4,000 per month—equivalent to a taxable income of at least $65,000. I would emphasize that this is the typical UN bureaucrat. The United States Mission to the United Nations

last year estimated that UN salaries were 40 percent higher than U.S. civil service salaries, which are ostensibly the standard of comparison.

I wonder how we can possibly ask the American taxpayer to accept sacrifices and a feeling of shared frugality when we are willing to fund, without question, such salaries?

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote was addressed solely to the issue of the cost of the United Nations. In the Dear Colleague I sent to the members of the Senate asking their support, I clearly indicated that this was the nature of the amendment. While there has been some attempt to interpret the Senate action as pique against recent UN votes or as a response to the colloquy between the Soviet and U.S. delegations in New York concerning the setting of the organization in the United States, this was not my goal.

It is claimed that the United States will lose its vote in the United Nations if this amendment is adopted into law. Similar predictions have been made whenever Congress has acted to control UN assessed contributions. Congress, nevertheless, acted, and the predictions have never come true.

It is theoretically possible that the United States could lose its vote in the UN General Assembly, although there is no provision for us to lose our vote in the Security Council. The amendment provides for no payment to be made to the United Nations and the four specialized agencies unless the payment is accepted as payment in full for the calendar year's assessments. Thus, the question that must be determined by these organizations is whether they are willing to forgo entirely the United States payment with the eventual possibility of depriving us of our vote two years hence. I do not believe that realistically such a policy will be adopted by these organizations.

It is also predicted that these cuts will make the UN less effective. Would not the reductions in staff and other administrative expenses create a more effective United Nations—one that is more clearly focused on the major issues of the day?

As a member of the Senate Budget Committee, I have had to make difficult choices between compelling but competing needs in both domestic and foreign affairs. Each of us in Congress has had to consider the difficult financial times that face both our government and our citizens today. Congress voted to limit Social Security cost of living increases. Can we then fund full cost of living increases for the UN staff? We have had to cut back social programs in the fields of medicine, employment, education, transportation, and so forth and cut back on the President's national defense budget.

Clearly, these cuts adopted by Congress reflect a belief that no program or expenditure is going to escape the careful scrutiny that we must maintain if we are ever to address the $200 billion deficit that burdens our economy.

SALARY RANGES AND NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AT THE UNITED NATIONS IN NEW YORK—MAY 1, 1983

43: Under Secretaries General—$84,456 after taxes.

66: Assistant Secretaries General—$77,846 after taxes.

285: D-2—$65,670 to $69,590 after taxes.

779: D-1—$58,681 to $65,563 after taxes; P-5—$53,656 to $62,036 after taxes; P-4—$45,370 to $56,053 after taxes; P-3—$38,719 to $49,549 after taxes; P-2—$32,912 to $40,998 after taxes; P-1—$26,995 to $33,894 after taxes.

This chart is based on guaranteed net salaries for UN employee plus $1,400 dependents allowance and $3,000 education allowance granted the average UN employee on the basis of a spouse and one child. Each additional child receives $3,700.

U.S. ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS OF U.N. COSTS

[Dollars in millions]

	Calendar year—			
	1972 (31.5 percent)	1980 (25 percent)	1983 (actual) (25 percent)	1972 to 1983 (percent of increase)
United Nations	$64.0	$149.7	$171.3	168
UNESCO	12.1	36.3	49.8	312
ILO	8.7	25.5	30.8	254
WHO	26.3	59.1	61.7	135
FAO	12.6	38.9	50.1	298

Senator KASSEBAUM. No.

Mr. LEACH. Concerning section B of your amendment, would it require the affected organization to accept the reduced U.S. contribution in full for the calendar year assessment? I have been informed by the State Department—President Reagan's State Department—that UN, ILO, WHO, FAO, and UNESCO would not be able to do this and that the result would be that the United States will lose its vote in the WHO, ILO, UNESCO, and FAO within 2 years, and in the United Nations itself, probably sometime within the next 5 years. Is this the goal of your amendment?

Senator KASSEBAUM. No, it is not. Why would they not be able to reduce it?

Mr. LEACH. Because they could not certify that it was a full assessment.

Senator KASSEBAUM. But you see, that is the rub. That is why it is in the amendment that way because otherwise we would be in arrears if they would not accept it as full payment.

Mr. LEACH. It is the rub, but I would stress that it is a view of the U.S. Department of State of the Reagan administration that this result would occur. So all I would stress is that as a legislative body we should be very careful to recognize the ramifications of your amendment as we look at this issue, at least on the side of——

Senator KASSEBAUM. I would say, Congressman, that is what I have been told the last 2 years, you see, and I guess I have to ask, if the United Nations really is not able to make this adjustment, and then do we just keep every year increasing that funding?

How do we get a handle on it? We are asking our own people to accept cuts. I really find it ironic that we can't say to the United Nations, "lower your housekeeping."

Mr. LEACH. I agree with that.

As you know, the United States has taken a strong lead at the United Nations in the last several years on spending. The WHO 1984-85 budget reflects a 0.3-percent program decrease as compared to the 1982-83 budget appropriations. As you know, in a number of other organizations, like the ILO, we are looking at program growth in the 1.89-percent range; in the FAO, less than that.

The point is, our leadership at the United Nations has taken a very firm, very tough stand under our President to hold down costs at the United Nations. The cost escalations that occurred in the 1970's were rather substantial and were from many Americans' point of view too much, although they were very much in line with the cost increases that have occurred in the Federal Government budget as well as in, for example, the congressional budget.

All I would say is that this administration has taken an extremely tough stand on cost issues at the United Nations and that we in Congress could, by capricious legislation, be jeopardizing the very efforts the administration is undertaking to hold down costs in that body.

Would you disagree with that perspective?

Senator KASSEBAUM. I would only point out that those changes in savings are simply a bookkeeping matter. It is a change in bookkeeping. We used to pay up front and now we pay—I suppose you would say—after the fact, and those savings, it is my understand-

ing, are merely a bookkeeping change. There is not any real reduction in spending.

Mr. LEACH. Let me make one comment and then I will be happy to yield.

Let me yield?

Mr. BONKER. Just on that point, I recall when Mr. Stockman engaged in a rather clever bookkeeping exercise to delay for 6 months our contributions to the United Nations. However, it benefited our bookkeeping, but certainly didn't help them because it delayed for a period of time money they badly needed. So it seems to me this adds insult to injury.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I am not arguing for the bookkeeping change. I am simply saying it is my understanding that is why there has been a reflection in savings.

Mr. LEACH. Let me comment further on that.

The figures I gave are the bottom line. They are not bookkeeping changes.

Second, in terms of perspective, as to whether a bookkeeping or more substantial change is at issue, the State Department of the Reagan administration has asserted to me that passage of your amendment would cause the following consequences: It would precipitate both a financial and political crisis in the affected organizations; it would alarm our allies in Third World countries regarding our continued commitment to world peace and security; the principle of collective financial responsibilities would be destroyed; an unfavorable precedent would be set for member States to contribute however much they wanted which would result in complete fiscal chaos; cash flow problems, already severe in the United Nations because of Soviet withholdings, would intensify to such an extent that the organizations would be unable to meet payroll and other mandatory obligations; and the United States would be blamed for the destruction of the United Nations even though the Soviet withholdings were responsible for the underlying financial weakness of the United Nations.

The point I am raising is that these consequences, as projected by the Reagan administration, go far beyond the conclusions of meager bookkeeping. Would you care to comment on that?

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, I guess your first question to me was the savings that had been made you felt were reflective of some important changes that have been done. I was only saying I thought that was merely a bookkeeping adjustment not reflective of real savings. If indeed the State Department determines that this would severely impact needed program needs—this is an argument of course that they have made ever since 1972, which was the last time the Congress changed our assessment level—it is hard to say.

I could only say I believe indeed that it would not cause the demise of the United Nations. There are those who would like to get involved in the argument presented from that side. There are others of us and many who did support me in this amendment who believe it could actually strengthen the United Nations, that we have reached a point in time when we need to say now, just a minute, we are in a different era, the United Nations can serve an enormously important role, but is there a better way, maybe a less costly way, to do it?

Mr. YATRON. We want to thank you.

Budget growth may be good—as in the defense budget today—or be unreasonable. Could you elaborate on the actual budget growth over the last 10 years of the U.N. agencies your amendment would cut?

How much of that growth actually has been to offset inflation which has been much higher in those countries where these agencies operate than in the United States?

Senator KASSEBAUM. It is about 273 percent in the last 10 years, the mandatory contribution.

Certainly some of that is attributable to inflation. I think, however, that that seems to be beyond the limits of what we could assume would be reasonable to ascribe to inflation.

Mr. YATRON. Could you also indicate what proportion of this budget growth might have reflected the deepening problems of some countries and the need for the services of these organizations?

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, this is what is troubling to me, Mr. Chairman, because I think that none of us would want to cut back on areas where we could really reach out to meet some of the needs, particularly of the developing countries. What concerns me the most is, as was reported in Senator Ribicoff's committee statement, that it has become a bloated, top-heavy organization and, because of that, really fails, I think, to do what it most needs to do today, I see no reason whatsoever that the truly necessary funds for the United Nations would be hurt by this amendment.

The Soviet Union has expressed a desire to reduce funding assessments in the United Nations. So has Great Britain. Many, many nations have expressed this. The trouble is that we all just have one vote and are frequently simply outvoted by nations that have about 2 percent of the budget assessed to them. So while we have frequently within the United Nations tried to address some needed changes that I think could be beneficial, we simply haven't been able to carry with the votes.

If I could go back to the inflation rate, this might be useful: Speaking to the 273-percent increase, during that same period of time the inflation increase was about 115 percent.

Mr. YATRON. But it is my understanding the U.S. budget only grew about 2 percent during this period of time.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, my goodness, the U.S. budget encompasses our entire way of life. There is social security and health care and not just spending for the functioning of Government as such. It covers a wide diversity of programs. I don't know that we could compare the two.

Mr. YATRON. Senator, subsection (A) of your amendment mandates a 30-percent cut below the 1980 assessment by 1987. Do you expect this difference will be picked up by other countries? If it is not picked up, what programs of each agency would you like to see eliminated?

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, that is always what people ask us when we talk about cutting our budget, we all seem to fudge that answer, don't we, when we are out speaking in our own district and States? That is for the United Nations to decide. They could either reduce our assessment, which of course is the largest assessment for one country, at 25 percent, or they could reduce the overall budget for the United Nations, or they could do both. But I think the United Nations would have to decide.

I suppose it is unrealistic to think they would reduce salaries, but it wouldn't be too unrealistic I think to suggest they might take a look at cutting back on some of the numbers of top-salaried positions.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you.

I would like to call on Mr. Leach.

Mr. LEACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just set one comment in perspective if I could.

You point out and cite Senator Ribicoff's comments about U.N. officials living in the lap of luxury. I think all of us who have ever been there realize there is a little bit of fluff in international politics. But, however, from another perspective—and I have served and worked at the United Nations and been in many offices in the headquarters establishment—it must be noted that those offices are less luxurious than the average New York corporate headquarters, far less luxurious than this building of the House of Representatives, and spectacularly less luxurious than the new Senate Office Building on the other side of the street.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I didn't think that was a good idea.

Mr. LEACH. I realize you didn't. But I think some perspective is important.

Let me ask you about the amendment you have offered that calls for a very profound change in American foreign policy. Can you tell us, did you offer this amendment with the support of the administration?

Senator KASSEBAUM. I didn't ask the administration. I informed them that I was going to do so.

Mr. LEACH. Did they object or——

Senator KASSEBAUM. They didn't comment one way or the other to me. They did in the debate on the floor, of course, take a position opposed to my amendment. But I guess I simply do not see why it should make a profound change. To me it is a sensible change and I don't know—at the time when we are asking our own civil service to take cuts, to look at adjustments in the cost of living. Why pay full cost of living adjustments for employees of the United Nations.

Mr. LEACH. Well, I am glad you could clarify for the record that during Senate considerations the administration opposed your amendment. The amendment you offered is personal, and is not the position either of the administration or the Republican Party per se.

I just think that if the United Nations should fail because we withdrew over 4 years $500 million in support, I would have to wonder if it wasn't a fairly weak reed to begin with.

Mr. LEACH. You make a fair point. But let me just conclude by noting that I know of few Members of the U.S. Senate that have served the body with more flair, capacity and soul-searching judgment than yourself, and I am sorry to be on the other side of this particular issue from you.

I think it is important, however, to note that the U.S. contribution to the United Nations is less in percentage of that total body's financing than the percentage of the U.S. GNP is to the world, and so we are providing less than we would under a worldwide flat tax not that anyone wants to view our contribution as a tax. In addition, it should be stressed that there was a period of time when we contributed far more to the United Nations than our percentage of the world's GNP. Thus, we are now contributing less in relation to other countries than 20 years ago.

I think as a kind of basic rule of thumb, we can't be way out of line if we are not contributing according to our own percentage of world GNP, although I think you do have a very valid point that the Congress does have a constitutional role to play in decisions on what we contribute to the United Nations and that one should never consider that role to be exactly a static one. It is, of course, appropriate to review U.N. contributions, but I just think at this particular time, given the rhetoric of the last week, that we may well have taken a dark ghost out of its canister and brought that ghost to real life. And that ghost is saying, let's be irresponsible about our international commitments. I would just hope that, as this House reviews the situation, if we take a different position than the Senate, that the Senate will not be absolutely committed to one particular perspective.

I thank you for taking the time to come over and see us.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you.

Mr. YATRON. The gentleman from Washington, Mr. Bonker.

Mr. BONKER. Senator Kassebaum, I admire you as a political moderate on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and particularly your work on African affairs. I doubt whether you represent a constituency that is universally concerned about what happens in Africa, but you have stood out as a role leader in that area. That is why I was a little surprised and disappointed when a CBS reporter called me the evening of the Senate action and asked for my comments on the amendment. I said I don't know, tell me about it. He did, and I said, who authored the amendment, thinking perhaps it was Senator Helms, and he told me.

I was in a state of disbelief.

Senator KASSEBAUM. So were some of my colleagues.

Mr. BONKER. I am sure.

Incidentally, Senator Helms introduced an amendment several years ago to forgo our contributions if that money through U.N. agencies was to be used for technical assistance. It really put us in a state of difficulty until we could come back the following year with corrective action. It was deemed at that time imprudent and seriously jeopardized our treaty obligations payments to the United Nations.

But I suppose one can expect that kind of action from certain political leaders and not expect it from others.

This whole notion of 10 percent each year sounds innocuous but kind of reminds me of supply side: 10 percent one year, 10 percent another. Perhaps we could call this supply-side diplomacy: The more we reduce our contribution the more effective it will be in our actions at the United Nations. I don't think that necessarily rings true. The United Nations is in a very difficult period and I think for those who support the United Nations we need to express that support in a variety of ways.

For several years I was chairman of this subcommittee and we conducted a series of hearings. Ambassador Richardson has been before the panel a number of times. They usually came as a result of some kind of revelation about the bloated U.N. budget or excessive spending. The Washington Post in 1979 had some colorful headlines about financial irresponsibility among the various agencies. And in all the hearings that we have conducted and all the audits and all the reports, none of those charges has ever been validated. So when you come before us and you say that the U.N. budget is bloated, and it isn't going to hurt at all to cut 10 percent this year and 10 percent the next year, I would have to ask you:

In your work on the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate, have you conducted hearings on the U.N. budget, have you looked closely at all the variations and their financial programs, have you asked for some kind of audit as to whether or not the programs meet cost performance tests, or is it just a common feeling among some people in the Senate that it is time we make an arbitrary 3-year 10-percent cut in their budget?

In other words, what kind of facts do you have on which you advance this amendment in the Senate?

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, we have not held a specific hearing on just U.N. assessment or called for any type of audit, but going back to the Government Affairs study in 1977, and each year when State Department authorization comes before the Foreign Relations Committee, we ask are these functions necessary, and usually we get State Department saying "well, we can't really make any reductions."

I guess my concern is, I do have some figures here, again going back to salaries—I hate to pinpoint salaries, but to me that is a place where I believe the bureaucracy of it all has gotten out of hand and whether our reduction in assessments will cause them to reassess that I am not sure. But, for instance, there are 43 Under Secretaries General that get a salary of $84,456 after taxes. There are 66 Assistant Secretaries General that get $77,846 after taxes. And D-2, 285 employees who get $65,670 to $69,590 after taxes, and so forth.

This is the part that troubles me and I really suppose an argument can be made——

Mr. BONKER. Senator, if that troubled you, have you and your colleagues ever penned a letter to the various directors of these agencies, or to the United Nations, and complained about the salaries?

Senator KASSEBAUM. There have been complaints raised by us at the United Nations. I don't have with me a list of votes last year in

which we voted no on changes that were increases, but as I say, we are outvoted.

Mr. BONKER. My constituents are not at all pleased with my salary, as I suppose your constituents are displeased with yours, and I am sure we cannot go low enough to reach that level of satisfaction. If I were to author an amendment to the legislative appropriations bill to cut it by 10 percent, I rather imagine my salary would be the last to be reduced. We would reduce constituent services or something else first.

We have to look at more than just salaries. We have to look at the programs and the people who are potential beneficiaries of these programs, especially the World Health Organization and UNESCO and others that are in the business of helping people. But if your concern is—I know it is genuine, but if it proves to be valid, it just seems to me that there are other more sophisticated ways that we can deal with it.

One is to have hearings. And I would guess that maybe you have not had hearings on your side, but we conducted, I don't know, Jim, maybe 1½ years of hearings on these agencies and their finances. We have subcommittee hearings that must be rather voluminous compared to other things that we have done, and not once did we find any evidence that there is financial irresponsibility in all of these agencies.

I would say, second, that if we are concerned again about salaries, that we would be more effective if we were to approach other nations and try to come up with collective action. I am not sure just a unilateral reduction in our contribution is going to bring about what you well hope to be a more effective agency or lower salaries.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Well, I would only suggest that in the past it has been tried and, as I say, those several nations that were troubled by increased funding have not been able to win there.

I share your concern, but this is an argument that is raised every time. For instance, you mentioned UNESCO. They have asked for a 37-percent increase in their budget. Well, I guess we can debate here whether indeed that is necessary or not, but frequently I suppose, we don't really know what would happen if indeed we said no, it isn't necessary and we do not have the votes in the United Nations to force a change, which I really tend to believe we can live with and even I would think would be an improvement.

Mr. BONKER. Let me conclude with two statements.

One, it is still a treaty obligation, and for a government and nation that stands on the notion that the law ought to be observed, I do not think this is a responsible action on our part, and second, if the reduction does result in lower salaries for these people who are at the under secretary or under executive director levels, then I would have to acknowledge that your efforts have borne fruit. But I rather imagine that the reduction is going to result in fewer programs and less attention to those people who are intended to be served by these agencies.

But I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, since you have oversight over this, that we renew our interest and perhaps have some hearings about the financial status of the U.N. agencies. We have already done comprehensive work in this, and Senator Ribicoff's

study goes back to 1977. I am not sure that is relevant to the economic and financial realities of today.

Mr. YATRON. I thank the gentleman.

We will consider following up on that in future hearings.

I would like to call on the gentlerman from California, Mr. Zschau.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Because I am a new Member in the House of Representatives and haven't had the benefit of the hearings that Congressman Bonker referred to, and because, Senator Kassebaum, of my immense respect and admiration for you and for your leadership in the other body, I am not willing to reject out of hand your proposal. I would like to explore the implications of your proposal and perhaps we could do that by my asking a series of questions about what the impact will be, because really that is what we are getting at.

You have suggested that we have an opportunity to save some money, and we may even make the United Nations more effective. Coming out of the business community, if you can get more for less, it sounds like a good deal. So I want to understand what the implications of the impact will be.

First of all, would you anticipate that the other members of the United Nations would follow a similar course; that is, if your amendment were to pass and to become law as it is written, would you expect that other members would do something similar?

Senator KASSEBAUM. It is difficult to say. As I said, both the Soviet Union and Great Britain have expressed a desire to see a reduction in funding and the Soviet Union has an 11-percent, I believe, assessment which they do not always pay in full; is that correct?

Mr. ZSCHAU. I am not able to answer that question. I would yield——

Senator KASSEBAUM. And I believe they don't pay in full, and we have always paid and I think we should pay in full, but I think it should be at a lower assessment.

I can't speak for what the other nations would think. I would believe that certainly some would consider this a wise move and others, as I say, those who don't have, nor could they have, as large an assessment, would be very disappointed.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Well, in making an evaluation of the proposal one has to make an assumption as to whether this would be an across-the-board cut by all of the other members or just represent the amount that the United States would reduce its assessment.

In order to help me make that judgment, could you tell me which way I ought to think about it? Should I think of it as just being an amount that the United States would remove from the budget of the United Nations or should I think of it as being a much bigger amount than that, anticipating that other nations would do the same thing?

Senator KASSEBAUM. I can't answer. I would assume, particularly the Europeans, might look to lowering their contribution and perhaps the Soviet Union, but it doesn't pay its assessment now, so I don't know if they would continue to pay what they have, and I am sorry I don't know what the amount is that they do pay.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Well, let me move on to the next implication. Let's assume for purpose of discussion that maybe half the nations follow suit and half the nations don't. I know that this is a difficult question to ask. Again as a new Member, I am trying to understand the implications of your proposal. Where would you expect that the cuts would have their impact in the programs? Are there some specific programs that you think would be reduced or would it be across-the-board—salaries, reduction in the number of people working there—what would be the impact that you would see?

Senator KASSEBAUM. I would hate to see a reduction in those areas where they are actually meeting the needs of various countries, particularly the developing nations. The World Health Organization has some very good programs that they have done. There are an awful lot of conferences that everyone attends and those serve a purpose up to a point. But again, I think its assessment, given the conditions that all the nations of the world are in right now from the economic point of view, must be controlled. You know, I can make a determination how I would reduce it, if I were in the United Nations, but I am not and so I think that is something they have to decide.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Well, maybe I could get your suggestion as to how you would take the reduced money and allocate it in the form of reduced expenses.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I would reduce conferences, I would reduce perhaps publications and paperwork and so forth, and I would reduce some of the top-level staffs. Again assessing where those could be done, they would not necessarily cut into really effective and needed work.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Are you suggesting that if half the nations did as we did, that that total amount that would be reduced from the U.N. budget could be offset by getting rid of unnecessary activities or people?

Senator KASSEBAUM. I think certainly some of it can. It is over a 4-year period of time and that would be an adjustment that could be, I think, lived with. If indeed with intensive study that this subcommittee has done on the United Nations, perhaps you are better able to address that than I specifically, but obviously you think really no reductions can be made. I can only offer my rather superficial observations plus visiting with those who have served as our representatives there, you know, unofficial representatives who do attend now and then who are strong supporters of the United Nations, who have called me since this amendment and said, "You are right on target."

Mr. ZSCHAU. Refresh my memory. How much money are we talking about the United States saving over a 3-year period of time?

Senator KASSEBAUM. Over 4 years it would be about $500 million.

Mr. ZSCHAU. So, if half of the nations follow suit, for the sake of argument double that, and we are talking about a billion dollar savings over a 4-year period of time.

How big is the total budget of the United Nations per year? I am not familiar with that.

Senator KASSEBAUM. It is about a billion and a half for the agencies concerned.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I guess in trying to understand what the impact is, I would have to make a judgment as to whether as you suggest we could do this without losing any of the essential services and activities the United Nations provides. But to go to the last point that I would like to ask about, you made a suggestion that if we did this, we might be able to take some new approaches that would make the United Nations more effective than it is currently, and I would like to ask you what you had in mind there.

Senator KASSEBAUM. I think even our own AID programs and so forth can use a reevaluation to make sure that money is being wisely spent. I frankly believe that we can do more by focusing in on smaller projects that meet the needs of the countries, whether it is in health or with the labor organizations, with education, than just grandiose conferences and reports that really fail frequently to get the money or the input there where it can best be used. I think that we have seen some smaller projects. I point to one in El Salvador that I think is working enormously well with a small amount of funding that was reluctantly finally given by AID. That was a co-op, which could begin then to process tomatoes which were a major product in the area, and yet they were not being fully utilized. They started a catsup plant, which has expanded and been very successful.

That is the kind of thing. This is speaking with one very small issue, but I find many times over a period of time we tend to grow barnacles on our programs and think that since that is the way it has always been, heavens, we can't change it or everything might fall apart.

All I am saying is I believe in my analysis of the money that was requested that the United Nations won't fall apart. It may shake things up enough that we would really rethink how in today's world we could better meet the needs. The figure might not be right, but I don't know that we will know unless we begin to try it.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Would you anticipate any impact whatsoever in the activities of the United Nations toward preserving peace in the world if we took this action? Do you think it would have a positive effect or negative effect or no effect?

Senator KASSEBAUM. It doesn't affect the voluntary organizations such as peacekeeping forces. That funding is not affected.

Mr. ZSCHAU. But would you expect that if the United States took this action, which in our entire history we have never done, would you anticipate that might have any effect in our ability to help preserve peace around the world?

Senator KASSEBAUM. I don't see that it would.

Mr. ZSCHAU. I thank you very much, Senator, for answering my questions.

Mr. YATRON. I would like to recognize Mr. Leach for a comment.

Mr. LEACH. Madam Senator, I would like to stress that I think several points you have made are quite valid. Your analogy of barnacles is particularly poignant. There are always problems in large institutions. The question, however, remains: What are our obligations under international law? How do we as a society deal with them? Here I think we should tip a hat to the administration for trying to impose a restraint on U.N. spending. But in tipping our

hat, we ought to support, rather than undercut, this administration's requests to Congress.

Second, I must confess to being a bit troubled by one implicit analogy you made and your comments regarding the fact that the Soviets don't meet their full obligation. I don't think that is a rationale for the United States not to meet its obligation.

Senator KASSEBAUM. No.

Mr. LEACH. That would be much like saying because the Soviets shot down a civilian airliner, we should shoot down one of theirs.

Senator KASSEBAUM. That is why I say we would fully meet our obligations.

Mr. LEACH. It is not clear that we would under your amendment because that isn't the way the rest of the world acts or the way our treaty obligations at this moment are written.

Third, we should be clear in noting that there aren't a lot of other countries in the world clamoring for this approach. I don't know of any of our allies that have publicly acclaimed this amendatory approach. Certainly, many of our allies are supporting a little greater restraint in growth in U.N. spending and they are working with us at the United Nations to try to put a cap, or at least a curb, on some of the growth we saw in the last decade, but that is a very different approach than advocating that either the United States or other Western governments ought to go back on their current commitments. I don't know of a single Western government that has advocated that.

If I am wrong, perhaps you could correct me and cite an example, but I don't know of any myself.

Senator KASSEBAUM. All I know is that, as I say, both the Soviet Union and Great Britain have expressed a desire to reduce spending.

Mr. LEACH. But not of this nature.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Perhaps they don't want to see us reduce ours.

Mr. LEACH. The Soviet Union is a model I don't think we want to replicate. I recently watched on television Britain's top U.N. functionary express great concern over what is happening in this country at this time and, as we look at our relations at the United Nations, it is very interesting to contract the enormous support Great Britain got in the Falkland crisis with the enormous difficulty we had in marshaling enough votes to force a Soviet veto on a patently uncivilized act, the Korean airliner incident.

It is my sense that our foreign policy at the United Nations has become un-British. In becoming very un-British, we have become much less effective than we once were. Not that our foreign policy should ever be "British," but if we look at different approaches to the managing of multilateral affairs in this kind of forum, we have got to ask ourselves whether declamatory rhetoric isn't of itself counterproductive.

Finally, let me stress with regard to your amendment, and your manner of presentation, that you should be complemented for the way you have avoided irresponsible and irrational diatribe. As much as I disagree with your approach, I think it has been presented in a very stateswomanlike way and for that I respect your initiative.

Thank you.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you.

Mr. YATRON. Senator Kassebaum, thank you very much for appearing here today and giving us the benefit of your views.

Senator KASSEBAUM. Thank you.

Mr. YATRON. Our final witness today is the Honorable Elliot Richardson, chairman of the U.N. Association of the United States of America. Elliot Richardson has had wide experience in Government, having served as Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and Attorney General.

His background in foreign affairs includes service as an Ambassador to the United Kingdom, Ambassador to the Law of the Sea negotiations, and Under Secretary of State.

Ambassador Richardson, we are pleased and honored to have you here today.

STATEMENT OF HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON, PRESIDENT, U.N. ASSOCIATION, ACCOMPANIED BY STEVEN A. DIMOFF, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON OFFICE, U.N. ASSOCIATION

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee. Before I proceed with my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the record show that I am accompanied by Steven A. Dimoff, director of the Washington office of the U.N. Association.

Mr. YATRON. We welcome Mr. Dimoff here today.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is a pleasure for me to testify once again before this subcommittee. I congratulate you on holding these hearings at this moment. The relationship between the United States and the United Nations is an important one that involves profound issues of this country's view of itself and of the world at large. As President Reagan once again reaffirmed in his speech to the opening session of the U.N. General Assembly yesterday, this country has been supportive of the United Nations since its founding.

"Our goals are those that guide this very body," he said, adding, "Our ends are the same as those of the United Nations founders." The President emphasized that, "The United Nations has a proud history of promoting conciliation and helping keep the peace. * * * The United Nations and its affiliates have made important contributions to the quality of life on this planet, such as directly saving countless lives through its refugee and emergency relief programs."[1]

Nevertheless, many people continue to question the usefulness of the world organization as this subcommittee has been just discussing, and the Senate recently voted to make debilitating cuts in U.S. support for the United Nations. In recent days, there has been a series of intemperate remarks about the United Nations, going so far as to question whether it should remain in the United States. These comments have been unfortunate, it seems to me, in all respects but one; namely, that they do provide an opportunity for re-

[1] See appendix 9 for text of speech.

flection on the underlying causes of the problem and the true attitudes of the American people.

I should like at this point to read to the subcommittee a brief statement on these issues by six former Secretaries of State, seven former U.S. Permanent Representatives to the United Nations, and two former National Security Advisers:

> The United Nations is an important instrumentality in the conduct of American foreign policy. Our experience, both in our public and private roles, has brought this home to us. The United Nations provides this country with a forum for protecting and promoting our own interests as well as for seeking solutions to problems we share with other countries.
>
> It is appropriate as well that this country should be the site of the United Nations, given the vision that has guided us as a nation and given the role we play, on all levels, in the world today. We all recognize the shortcomings of the United Nations, but we live in a very imperfect and increasingly dangerous world and we must make the best use possible of whatever means we have for managing the problems that beset us.

Those who have authorized me to make this statement on their behalf include Alexander M. Haig, Henry A. Kissinger, Edmund Muskie, William P. Rogers, Dean Rusk, Cyrus Vance; former National Security Advisers Zbigniew Brzezinski, Brent Scowcroft; and former U.N. Ambassadors George Ball, Arthur Goldberg, Donald McHenry, Daniel P. Moynihan, John Scali, William Scranton, and Andrew Young. Needless to say, I heartily concur with the sentiments of this distinguished bipartisan group.

For my own remarks here today, I shall begin with some comments on the location of the United Nations in the United States. It is generally accepted that President Roosevelt pressed to have the headquarters of the United Nations in this country because he wanted to do all that he could to thwart efforts by American isolationists—of whom there seems always to be a vocal if not large contingent—to keep the United States from joining the organization. But that is history. What is more important is that there are good reasons today for keeping the U.N. headquarters here.

Some of them are practical—the United Nations contributes about $700 million to the New York area economy alone, nearly as much as the U.S. portion of the entire U.N. budget. In addition, U.N. development programs spend substantial sums for U.S. goods and services.

Second, it is useful to the United States to have delegates from virtually every country in the world experience American society at firsthand. Those of us who have genuine confidence in the strength and attractiveness of our system can only welcome this unique opportunity to impress the rest of the world.

What I believe to be the most important considerations, however, are less tangible. This country is the proper site for the preeminent world organization because of the role America plays in the world. The United States is not just the leader of a coalition, nor just a leader of a certain group of countries that share our values and political system, it is the leading country in the entire world community. It is regarded as such by all, though the fact may not always be admitted or rejoiced in. As such it is our proper function and our responsibility to be the home of the United Nations.

We should all recognize, however, that the argument is not really about the site of the United Nations. It is about the organi-

zation itself, and our relationship to it, and in turn it is about how we see ourselves in relation to the rest of the world and how we believe the problems we face should be dealt with.

To some extent, of course, the thought that the United Nations might take itself elsewhere reflects exasperation at criticism by others, and it evaporates with the first sober thought about what the United Nations means for us. As such, it is inconsequential.

At another level, however, it reflects the persistent presence in this country of a narrow nationalism that once was called isolationism. Although it has long been a feature of the American political scene, it is not a characteristically American viewpoint. It is a form of ideology, and we are a people who have generally shunned ideology, and who developed pragmatism to a fine art.

It emphasizes fear and suspicion of the outside world, and we are a people who have thrived on confidence and an openness to the rest of the world. It is at heart a rejection of cooperative ways of dealing with problems, while no people in the world has prided itself more, or with more reason, on knowing how to make things work by cooperative effort.

The rallying point for this narrow viewpoint is hostility to the United Nations, though it is not the United Nations itself that is fundamentally at issue. Like other attempts to adjust to the realities of global independence, the United Nations is the target of a sense of frustration and resentment. These feelings spring from a number of simplistic assumptions, all of them wrong: That the United States is still consistently able, as we like to think it once was, to protect and promote its own interests solely by its own efforts; that organized, multilateral means of solving or dealing with problems are not only in the main unnecessary, but are to be distrusted; and that unilateralism is forced on us by an essentially hostile world.

This is a crippling vision of the world for a superpower with global responsibilities. Whether we like it or not, our fate is indissolubly bound up with the actions of countries with different economic, political and social systems, as well as with other developed Western countries. In today's world, scarcely an important American interest, and no serious threat to our well-being, is within our power to manage or control by ourselves or with a few friends.

Native American pragmatism, faced with that reality, would see only one sensible course—to employ every available means, including the use of multilateral organizations, to bring to bear on these concerns the joint efforts of the countries necessary to their successful management.

Fortunately, the American people continue to show the commonsense and pragmatism they are known for. A public opinion poll conducted this past summer by the Roper organization for the U.N. Association demonstrates once again that a clear majority of the public believes that the United Nations is important, that the United States should maintain or increase its participation in it, and that the organization is a place where we can hope to work out acceptable solutions to important problems.

Only a small minority characterizes the United Nations—as do the neoisolationists—as an anti-American organization where a hostile majority consistently comes to decisions against U.S. inter-

ests. Roughly the same number—19 percent—would have the United States give highest priority to answering attacks on their country in the United Nations rather than on working for agreements on major global issues.

Mr. YATRON. Excuse me for interrupting. We unfortunately have a vote on an amendment on the coal slurry pipeline bill. We would like to recess for about 10 minutes to go over and vote. When we come back you can resume your statement. I am sorry that we have to interrupt you.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be right here.

[Brief recess.]

Mr. YATRON. The subcommittee will resume its hearing.

Mr. Ambassador, we again apologize for the delay. You may proceed, Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I was just about to offer for inclusion in the record of this hearing, the poll results of the Roper poll that I had mentioned just before the recess.

Mr. YATRON. Without objection, Mr. Ambassador.

[The poll follows:]

United Nations Association of the United States of America
300 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017 212 697 3232

UN STILL WINS APPROVAL OF MOST AMERICANS,
ROPER POLL REPORTS

By a sizable majority, Americans believe that enough common ground exists in the UN to make it worthwhile for the US to work within the organization and that decisions taken at the UN are largely compatible with US interests. In addition, a near majority of those polled want the US Government to pursue policies in the UN aimed at reaching agreements acceptable to the broadest possible number of countries. Only 19 percent give highest priority to answering attacks on the US, and less than one-fourth think the United Nations has become an anti-American organization.

These are the major conclusions of a Roper Poll commissioned by the United Nations Association (UNA-USA) to gauge public support for the UN. Also included in the Poll is a survey of UNA's members' attitudes towards the UN.

After releasing the Poll, Orville L. Freeman, Chairman of the Board of Governors of UNA-USA stated: "The message to Washington is clear: if the US takes the lead in defining what it wants from the United Nations, the American public is prepared to see the UN assume a more active role in resolving global problems."

Heavy majorities of those polled thought the UN should be given more power to reduce the possibility of superpower confrontation, strengthen human rights, conserve natural resources, and promote economic development. In addition, fewer people appear to be dissatisfied with the UN than was true in past polls, although a majority would withhold US contributions to

express disapproval of specific UN programs.

According to Burns Roper, head of the Roper Organization, which conducted the survey, "The American people display a highly realistic view of the United Nations. While people feel the UN has done a far from perfect job, they nevertheless support the UN and would give it more scope and greater power because of the crucial areas in which it operates."

The Poll was completed in June 1983, as part of a new UNA-USA program on Multilateral Issues and Institutions. This program seeks to stimulate creative thinking to make the UN more effective and to develop US policy initiatives in the United Nations system.

The United Nations Association of the United States of America (UNA-USA) is an independent, non-partisan, nationwide membership organization. Through its programs of research and education it seeks to strengthen public knowledge about the United Nations, to increase the effectiveness of international organizations, and to promote constructive US policies on matters of global concern.

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA
300 EAST 42nd STREET, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

DIRECTIONS FOR THE UN:

US Public Opinion on the United Nations

Results of the 1983 Roper Poll
Commissioned by UNA-USA

Background Paper Prepared by UNA-USA, September 1983

Summary of the Findings

Americans have once again reaffirmed their belief that the United Nations plays a constructive role in US foreign policy. They recognize a tremendous need for enhancing international stability and promoting economic development and see the UN as an appropriate vehicle for accomplishing these tasks. A clear majority of the American people finds that "enough common ground exists on most issues to make it worthwhile for the US to work within the UN" or that "decisions taken by UN members are largely compatible with our own interests." In addition, a near majority wants the United States to pursue active engagement in the UN in order to "work for agreements on major global issues that are acceptable to the broadest number of countries possible."

In terms of the American public's agenda for the UN, the results are rather clear cut — strive for consensus agreements in the UN to reduce the danger of superpower conflict, strengthen human rights, conserve natural resources, and speed economic development.

The attitudes expressed in the Roper Poll cut across all groups in the population, ranging from conservative to liberal, from Republican to Democrat. Indeed, the "common ground" position and the "consensus" position represent not only the first choice of the total sample, but even more significantly, they represent the first choice of every one of the forty population subgroups tabulated. Opinion is also remarkably uniform throughout the country on giving the UN more power to deal with the priority tasks listed above.

An important conclusion from this year's Roper Poll is that fewer people appear to be dissatisfied with the UN than was true in the past. Indeed, the number of respondents asserting that the United Nations is doing a poor job is less in 1983 than it was three years ago when UNA-USA conducted its last Roper Poll, and more think the UN is doing a fair job (46%) than think it is doing a poor job (37%). At the same time, a smaller percent of the population is supportive of increasing US participation in the UN than was the case in 1980,[1] although a majority is still in favor of either maintaining current levels of activity or increasing the US role in the UN. When the UN acts contrary to perceived American interests, however, there is a clear mandate for curtailing financial support for specific UN programs.

Despite disappointments with the past, there still exists a consistently strong constituency for strengthening the United Nations. Well over 60% of the American people believe that the UN should be given more power to reduce the danger of superpower confrontation, enhance human rights, and conserve natural resources. In addition, over 50% believe the UN should play a greater role in helping poor countries develop. Of the seven specific issues listed, in no case did the public feel that the UN ought to have less power to deal with the problem.

The groups which give the United Nations the greatest degree of support are the following:

Stronger with women than men;
Stronger with under 60 year olds than over 60;
Stronger with above average incomes than below;
Stronger outside the South than in it;
Stronger with Democrats and Independents than Republicans;
Stronger with liberals than conservatives; and
Stronger with political/social actives than with others.

---

[1]See "Analysis of Data in the Roper Poll on US Public Attitudes towards Foreign Affairs" (Background Paper Prepared by UNA-USA, October 1980), cited by Paul Martin, "US Public Opinion and the UN," in Toby Trister Gati (ed.), The US, the UN and the Management of Global Change (New York: New York University Press, 1983).

These are the major conclusions of a poll recently conducted by the Roper Organization for UNA-USA. This poll was commissioned in June 1983 as part of UNA's program on Multilateral Issues and Institutions and updates an earlier 1980 survey of American perceptions of the UN and the US role in the United Nations.

Also included in this report are the conclusions of a similar survey of over 1,000 of UNA's 20,000-member national constituency in which UNA members responded to the same questions presented to the national sample. This second survey gives additional insights into the views of a particularly politically active, internationalist segment of the American people.

The attitudes of UNA's membership underscore the general trends outlined in the nationwide Roper Poll: support for active US engagement in the UN's search for consensus agreements on problems that concern the entire international community. Eighty percent of UNA members favor increasing US participation in the UN. By a similar margin, they believe that enough common ground can be found to warrant bringing important problems to the UN. Although a greater percentage of UNA members feels the UN is doing a good job than among the general public, almost one-fourth of those polled believe the UN is not performing as well as it could. With a few exceptions, the UNA membership poll comes closest to the views expressed by the political activist subgroup in the Roper Poll. UNA members represent a highly educated, politically vocal segment of the population, people who can often exert considerable influence both in their local communities and in national politics.

A detailed analysis of the Roper Poll and the survey of UNA's membership follows.

Analysis of the Poll

QUESTION:

Which one of these three statements comes closest to your feelings about the UN today?

The basic beliefs and decisions taken by UN members are largely compatible with our own interests.....11%

Although the US is frequently outvoted, enough common ground exists on most issues to make it worthwhile for the US to work within the UN.....49%

The UN has become an anti-American organization where a hostile majority consistently comes to decisions against US interests.....23%

Don't know.....18%

Many more see the UN as compatible with US interests than see it as hostile to the United States. This feeling is particularly strong among those under 45, those in higher income and occupational groups, and those with higher educational levels. The Northeast and Midwest are strongest in affirming the compatibility of the UN with US interests, whereas the South and West are more of the opinion that the UN has become an increasingly anti-American organization.

There is no difference between Democrats, Republicans and Independents in their expression of support for continued US participation in the UN, although more Republicans say that the UN is compatible with US interests and that it is increasingly hostile to US interests. (The difference is in the smaller number of "don't knows" among Republican respondents.) Conservatives share the Republican concern about anti-Americanism at the UN, but they nonetheless support the UN almost as strongly as other political affiliations do. Among the politically active, the level of commitment to the UN is also significantly higher -- 60% believe that the best US policy is to work within the UN and an additional 10% see the UN as complementing basic US foreign policy objectives.

However, the willingness to compromise or to continue to play an active role at the UN despite being outvoted is not universally shared. Almost one in four respondents believe that the UN is an anti-American organization. This feeling is strongest among older people, blacks, Southerners, those with only a high school education, Republicans and conservatives. Beliefs that the UN is hostile and anti-American range from lows of 18% among both the youngest age group and liberals, and 19% among women and executive/professionals, to highs of only 27% among men, blacks, Republicans and conservatives, and 28% of people 60 or older.

Among the UNA sample, almost four-fifths (79%) believe that sufficient common ground exists to warrant a significant commitment by the United States to active participation in the UN and an additional 13% feel the basic orientation of the UN is compatible with US national interests. This compared favorably with the opinions expressed by the college educated, liberals, and the political activists polled by the Roper Organization.

QUESTION:

Here are three different approaches the United States could take in the UN. If the United States could only do one of these three things, which one would you most like to see us do?

Answer more directly attacks on the United States that are made in the UN.....19%

Work behind the scenes with friendly countries to have our point of view prevail.....19%

Work for agreements on major global issues that are acceptable to the broadest number of countries possible.....48%

Don't know.....14%

The clearly preferred approach for US foreign policy in the UN is to work for consensus agreements with allies and other countries. Taken together, the latter two choices, both of which presuppose compromise and active participation in the UN's work, account for 67% of the total. Only one person in five favors directly confrontational tactics, a policy which presumably would make it difficult to achieve the compromise agreements implied in the other two choices.

Support for compromise and consensus is strongest among younger people (those under 45), in the Midwest and West, and among the more highly educated and politically active. There is no significant difference between Democrats, Republicans and Independents on this question, although liberals do appear to be stronger adherents of the consensus approach and there is greater support for answering attacks on the United States in a more forceful manner among Republicans.

By a lopsided majority (80%), UNA members favor compromise and consensus building as opposed to an aggressively offensive US policy in the United Nations. An additional 11% prefer behind the scenes efforts to gather support for American policy initiatives. These preferences correspond most closely to those expressed by executives/professionals, college graduates, liberals, and political activists in the Roper sample.

32-616 O - 84 - 5

The next two questions are trend questions which measure the level of support and approval of the United Nations, even if they do not suggest the reasons underlying these opinions. The first question concerning the proper level of US participation in the UN was asked once before (1980) and the second one, assessing the performance of the UN, was asked twice before (1980 and 1977).

QUESTION:

Should the US increase or should it decrease its participation in the UN?

	1983	1980
Increase.....	32%	40%
Decrease.....	25%	21%
No change..... (volunteered)	25%	26%
Don't know....	18%	14%

More people would increase US participation in the UN than would decrease it. In addition, a clear majority of all age groups (except the very oldest), all income and educational groups (except the lowest in each category), all regions, all races, and all political parties and political affiliations would either maintain today's active US role in the UN or support an even greater level of American involvement in the UN. However, the percent willing to support a larger US role in the UN appears to have decreased since the last Roper Poll, while the number that would lessen US involvement in the UN appears to have increased in 1983.[2]

---

[2]The Roper Organization, which conducted the poll for UNA-USA, has analyzed the data and believes that the "the decline in sentiment for increased US participation in the UN is due to the change in question order [in administering the poll] rather than a change in public opinion." The increase/decrease question, first this year, was fifth in 1980; the good/poor question, second this year, was first in 1980. The 1980 order for the increase/decrease question was, according to Roper, an unfortunate placement for a question that was to become a trend measurement. This explanation is further supported by the fact that the "don't know" percentage is higher this year than in 1980. This is probably because this year the question reported a person's first thought about the UN, whereas three years ago, it was the person's fifth thought. Being caught unawares by the question, more therefore said "don't know."

This analysis may in part explain the apparent paradox of a poll in which fewer people appear to want to increase participation in an organization that is judged to have substantially improved its performance in recent years.

Age is an important factor in determining the level of support for an activist US policy in the UN: the youngest age group (those under 30) favors increased participation by a significantly greater margin than do people in their forties and fifties (37% to 29%) and by an even greater spread over those in the 60 and over group (37% to 22%). As household income and educational level rises, so does the number of people in favor of increased US participation in the United Nations. For example, only a quarter of those earning $10,000 per year or less favor increasing the US role in the UN, while 36% of those earning $30,000 or more favor this course of action. The Northeast and the West are the regions most supportive of a greater US role in UN affairs, while the South clearly emerges as the region least supportive of the US commitment to the UN. One-third of those polled, regardless of their political affiliation, reaffirmed support for greater US involvement in the UN; however, Republicans stand out in the larger number calling for less participation (31% vs. 24% for Democrats and 22% for Independents), as do conservatives (29% vs. 22% for moderates and 23% for liberals). Liberals are generally characterized by a significantly higher level of support for increased US participation in the UN (37% as compared with 31% for moderates and 30% for conservatives).

Over four-fifths of the UNA sample would increase the US role in the UN, while only 4% would decrease US participation in the UN. This is significantly greater than any of the groups included in the Roper sample, reflecting the internationalist orientation and commitment to multilateral institutions that one would expect from those who choose to be members of an organization like UNA-USA.

QUESTION:

In general, do you feel the UN is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has to face?

	1983 (Sample divided into two halves)		1980	1977
	More in-depth response	Trend sample		
Good job	21%	35%	30%	32%
Poor job	37%	42%	53%	39%
In between (volunteered)	25%	xxx[3]	xxx[3]	xxx[3]
Don't know	16%	23%	18%	29%

As in 1980, more people feel the UN is doing a poor job than a good job. However, the "good job" percentage in the half of the sample comparable to polls taken in previous years (the trend sample)

---

[3]Volunteered "in between" answer category not provided thus forcing people into "good job," "poor job" or "don't know."

is well above its 1980 level and somewhat above the 1977 level. More significantly, the number of people responding that the UN is doing a poor job has decreased dramatically from the 1980 totals, and again approximates the levels recorded in the 1977 poll.

In the belief that the working of this question as posed in previous polls offered choices too extreme to capture many people's true feelings about how well or how poorly the UN is doing, this year's question was asked two ways: half the respondents were asked the trend version of the question which appeared in 1977 and 1980 (and gives the person being polled an opportunity to answer only good or bad) and the other half were able to express a more "middle of the road" position about how the UN is performing in addition to the choices of good and poor.[4]

If one looks only at the good/poor responses, the conclusion would be that more think the UN is doing a bad job than a good job. However, the results of the revised approach to this question suggest a somewhat different conclusion: that more people think the UN is doing a fairly good job (46%) than think it is doing a poor job (37%). When given the opportunity to register an "in between" answer, that is to say, a "not so good, not so bad" kind of response, the good job rating dropped 14 points, bad job dropped 5 points, and "don't know" dropped 7. Although "in between" was not offered as an answer option, it was nevertheless the second most frequently given answer. Had it been built into the wording of the question, it might well have been the biggest answer.

It is plausible to conclude that "in between" is probably about all the public realistically expects of the UN, given the incredibly complex issues before the organization, even if it would like a lot more.

Based on this analysis, the Roper Organization concludes that "the upward trend in the good job/poor job question is valid while the downward 'trend' in the increase/decrease question is misleading."

Using data from the trend sample, in which only good or bad were offered as choices, the following conclusions present themselves. Males clearly think less of the UN's performance than females -- only 32% of males vs. 38% of females thought the UN was doing a good job and 50% of the men (vs. 35% of the women) thought it was doing a poor job. Respondents in the over-60 age group were consistently less supportive of the UN, with only 26% believing that

---

[4]"In between" was not included in the choice of responses in the sample. The wording respondents actually heard was identical in both halves of the sample, but how their responses were handled was different. If respondents would not fit into "good job" or "poor job" on the trend version of the question, they were recorded as "don't know." In the more in-depth sample, the answers recorded on the questionnaire, although not the question wording itself, allowed for an additional volunteered answer--"in between."

the UN is doing a good job as opposed to 35% of the 18-29 year olds and 39% of those from 30-44. On the other hand, the number of people responding that the UN is doing a poor job is relatively consistent for the four age groups polled. As income, educational and occupational levels rise, so does dissatisfaction with the job the UN is doing. Nearly one-half of the executive/professional, college-educated, and $30,000-plus income groups think the UN is doing a poor job. These are the same groups, it should be recalled, that expressed stronger sentiment for increasing US participation in the UN in the previous question. The Northeast and West give the UN the highest marks, while the response of those in the South is the most uniformly negative: only 32% of Southerners believe the UN is doing a good job and 45% say it is performing poorly. Members of all political parties and all political philosophies give the UN approximately the same approval rating (the range is from 33-37%), but Republicans and conservatives do show a considerably higher level of dissatisfaction with the UN. Fifty-two percent of Republicans and 47% of conservatives feel the UN is doing a poor job whereas only 39% of the Democrats and Independents and 38% of the moderates feel the same way. Liberals are to be found midway between the two, with 43% indicating that the UN is doing a poor job. The highest level of dissatisfaction by far comes from those who see themselves as political activists -- 56% of this group think the UN is doing poorly.

Turning to the revised, more in-depth response to the question, in which respondents were able to select an "in between" choice in assessing the UN's performance, there is a marked shift in the assessment made by many of the subgroups. In some cases, the changes are quite dramatic, with as many as a third of the respondents in any one category changing their views. The largest shift is usually among those who say the UN is doing a good job -- approximately twice as many in this group changed their answer from "good" to "in between" as shifted from "poor" to "in between." The largest shifts occurred among blacks, Southerners, non-high school graduates, and political activists.

Only in the case of the politically active groups and among Republicans did the percent change from "poor" to "in between" equal the percent shift from "good" to "in between." (Thirty-two percent of the politically active shifted to an "in between" response, as did 22% of the Republicans in the poll.) This suppports the hypothesis that even with those groups registering the strongest opinions about the UN in the trend question (in these two cases, negative opinions), the more nuanced answer is more reflective of their true views of the UN. In addition, when the good and "in between" answers of these two groups are combined, then 52% of the political activists and 45% of

the Republicans assess the UN's performance as acceptable. (This contrasts with a poor rating of 56% for political activists and 52% for Republicans in the trend question.) The results are as striking when the responses of other groups to the two forms of this question are analyzed.

The clear conclusion is that more people think the UN is doing a better than poor job than think it is doing a poor job. While many groups are still very critical of the UN's performance, the fact is that it cannot be easily assessed in simple black and white terms. Indeed, when those answering that the UN is doing a good job are added to those responding that its performance is neither very good nor extremely poor, a near majority believe that the UN is functioning reasonably well.

This conclusion is supported by the answers given to a list of specific tasks before the UN in which those polled were asked whether the UN should be given more or less power to deal with a particular problem. (See pages 12 and 13 of this report.)

UNA members are more inclined to evaluate the UN's performance in a favorable light than is the general public. By a 5 to 2 margin (56% to 23%), those polled expressed the view that the UN is doing a good job. This is significantly less than the number of UNA members who want to increase participation in the UN, reflecting the same tendency observed in the attitudes of the general public -- although most people would want the UN to do more, they are rather realistic in their expectations of what it actually has done and can do in the future. As in the general sample and in the political activists subgroup, more UNA members feel the UN is doing a poor job (23% vs. 56% for the politically active and 42% for the entire sample) than want to decrease participation in the organization (4% of UNA members vs. 24% for political activists and 25% for the general public).

QUESTION:

Some people say we should exercise more control over how our money is used at the UN by withholding part of our financial support when we do not agree with what the UN is doing. Of course, similar steps might be taken by other major contributors to cut programs we support. Do you think we should or should not withhold our financial support when the UN does things we disagree with?

Should withhold.....51%

Should not.....32%

Don't know.....17%

Dissatisfaction with the United Nations is most vividly expressed in the question concerning when and how the US should contribute to various UN programs. While some subgroups are less inclined to withhold US financial support for certain UN activities than are other groups -- primarily the higher income and occupational groups, the liberals and the independents -- 39 of the 40 subgroups tabulated are more inclined to withhold contributions than not. Of all the categories polled, only people in executive/professional occupations are more inclined not to place conditions on US contributions to the UN -- and then only by one percentage point (46% to 45%). Conservatives would withhold US contributions by a margin of almost 2:1 and Republicans by a 5:3 margin.

Age is not nearly as significant a variable as it is on other questions in the poll -- the youngest and oldest groups differ by only 3% (50% to 53%) in their belief that the US should restrict its contribution to the UN under certain circumstances. Whites are more inclined to withhold funds than are blacks (52% to 43%). People from the Northeast and South are more strongly in favor of withholding US contributions, while the strongest sentiment for continued support of the UN, even when its activities seem objectionable, comes from the Western parts of the country.

Among UNA members, the question of financial contributions does not appear to be linked to approval or disapproval of the UN's performance as expressed in the previous two questions. Eighty-five percent of UNA's constituents would not punish the UN when its member states take actions with which the US Government may disagree, while only 9% would withhold US financial contributions to express disapproval with the UN. This opinion may be prompted by concern that such a policy could lead to institutional paralysis or tit-for-tat politics, thus interfering with the UN's work across the board.

The desire to exercise greater control over US contributions to the UN is very strongly and widely felt, but it does not indicate a lessened commitment to the UN when it tackles important international issues, as the results of the next question clearly indicate.

QUESTION:

Here are several things the UN is concerned with. For each, should the UN be given more power to deal with these issues or less?

	More	Less	Same (Volunteered)	Don't Know
Reducing the danger of superpower confrontation	67%	12%	9%	12%
Supporting human rights	67%	13%	13%	8%
Conserving natural resources	64%	13%	12%	10%
Helping poor countries develop	55%	22%	14%	9%
Managing the world economy	47%	26%	14%	13%
Preventing local conflicts	41%	31%	15%	13%
Aiding refugees	37%	37%	16%	10%

When it comes to strengthening the United Nations on the seven issues presented, more people said "more" than said "less" on six of the seven. On the last issue, opinion split evenly. None of the seven got greater "less" than "more" sentiment. This is true for every subgroup queried, with the widest margin of support for the UN once again among the younger groups, the better educated, and higher income groups.

The level of support among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents is relatively uniform as concerns the role of the UN in resolving political conflicts, conserving natural resources, and enhancing human rights. However, in several cases support for the UN's economic development work is significantly weaker among certain groups, primarily Republicans and conservatives. Yet even here, the pattern is not entirely consistent: 60% of the Republicans polled would increase the UN's power to help poor countries develop -- 7% more than that registered by Independents and 5% more than among Democrats. Only liberals scored higher when asked this question.

In the area where support for UN efforts is lowest (aiding refugees), it may be that certain international and domestic factors influence how people respond to this issue. On the international front, the politicization of the Palestinian refugee issue and, domestically, concern about being overwhelmed by new refugee populations or fear of losing jobs to legal or illegal immigrants may color the view of what the UN is doing or should be doing in this

area. Particularly suggestive of this conclusion is the significantly greater opposition to UN refugee-related work in the Southern areas of the country -- where only 31% favor giving the UN more power to deal with the problem and 40% want it to have less power -- and the low level of support for UN efforts among non-high school graduates and those earning under $10,000, the very groups that would be most threatened economically by waves of new immigrants.

Black American opinion differs significantly from whites on issues of war and peace as well as those involving economic development. Blacks are more supportive of the UN's work in several areas. Eighty-one percent of blacks and only 64% of whites want the UN to do more to strengthen human rights, 63% of black Americans and 54% of whites want the UN to help poor countries more, and half the blacks but only two-fifths of the whites want the UN's role in resolving local conflicts to be enhanced. Only on the issue of conserving natural resources are blacks less supportive of strengthening the UN than whites (59% of blacks vs. 65% of whites).

Respondents in the UNA poll also favor increasing the UN's power to resolve political conflicts and spur economic development. In all cases, they do so by even larger margins than do those polled by the Roper Organization. They give highest priority to strengthening the UN's ability to manage the superpower competition, advance human rights, conserve natural resources, and aid less developed countries -- exactly the same four issues singled out by the general public and the political activists as most important. Only very small percentages would favor reducing the UN's power to deal with the seven issues cited. The largest discrepancy between the answers given by the general public and those provided by UNA members concern aid to refugees — over 80% of UNA members but only 37% of the general public favors increasing UN efforts in this area. The very different response to this question may mean that the domestic and international concerns outlined above influence the opinion of UNA's membership significantly less than they do that of the public at large. It may also reflect greater knowledge of what the UN actually does to alleviate the suffering of refugee populations.

The seven issues presented in the poll cover a wide range of UN activities in the political, economic, and humanitarian fields, representing areas where the UN already plays an active role and where the track record is already there to examine. Therefore, it is particularly revealing that with the exception of only three subgroups in one of the questions (aid to refugees), the number of respondents in both the Roper Poll and the UNA poll wanting to either increase or maintain current levels of UN activity constitutes an absolute majority in <u>all</u> cases.

32-616 O - 84 - 6

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to spend a minute or two calling attention to some of the most indicative of these results.

When people polled were asked which of three statements came closest to their feelings about the United Nations today, by far the greatest number—49 percent—agreed that, "Although the United States is frequently outvoted, enough common ground exists on most issues for the United States to work within the United Nations."

Asked whether the United Nations should be given more power or less power to cope with seven major global issues, 67 percent wanted the United Nations to have more power to deal with reducing the superpower confrontation and with supporting human rights, 64 percent advocated giving it more power to conserve natural resources, and 55 percent wanted the United Nations to do more to help poor countries develop. On none of the issues were more voices heard for lessening U.N. power than for increasing it.

The public response was realistic both in its appreciation of the United Nations' usefulness and in its awareness that the United Nations is far from perfect. Forty-six percent thought the United Nations was doing a good or fairly good job; 42 percent thought it was doing a bad job—a more favorable rating, incidentally, than in a 1980 poll commissioned by U.N. Association of the United States of America. At the same time, 57 percent wanted the United States to increase its participation or leave it at present levels, against 25 percent who wanted it decreased. Just over half believed the United States should exercise more control over how its money is used by withholding part of our financial support when the United Nations does things we disagree with.

These mixed and discriminating responses reveal a thoughtful appreciation of the United Nations and the very mixed bag of a world it reflects. What the public seems to be saying in its pragmatic way is that there are critical problems the United States cannot deal with alone, that the United Nations can help deal with them, and that we should not get too upset about the rhetoric. On the other hand, the public also seems to be saying that the United Nations is not dealing adequately with these problems.

The poll results speak of increasing the U.N. powers. This translates, in part, into an increased commitment by the member governments to use the United Nations for solving problems. It also means finding ways to make the organizations that constitute the U.N. system work better, as well as devising new means to address new or changing problems.

The focus of debate in this country about the United Nations should be on these practical issues. It too seldom is. We are diverted from serious purposes by such irrelevancies as petulant comments about the U.N. presence in this country. Not nearly enough creativity and energy is being expended on generating policies that will shape the institutional means to meet future crises.

The United Nations Association of the United States of America has underway a major new program designed to produce ideas and propose constructive courses of action. It will make an important contribution in itself, but should also stimulate a wider effort in

the universities, public affairs institutions, and the Government. There are few tasks more urgent.

That concludes my statement. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to respond to any questions you or members of the subcommittee may have.

[Mr. Richardson's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON, PRESIDENT, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

It is a pleasure for me to testify once again before this subcommittee. I congratulate you on holding these hearings at this moment. The relationship between the United States and the United Nations is an important one that involve profound issues of this country's view of itself and of the world at large. As President Reagan once again reaffirmed in his speech to the opening session of the U.N. General Assembly yesterday, this country has been supportive of the U.N. since its founding. "Our goals are those that guide this very body," he said, adding, "Our ends are the same as those of the U.N.'s founders." The President emphasized that, "The U.N. has a proud history of promoting conciliation and helping keep the peace. . . . The U.N. and its affiliates have made important contributions to the quality of life on this planet, such as directly saving countless lives through its refugee and emergency relief programs."

Nevertheless, many people continue to question the usefulness of the world organization. The Senate recently voted to make debilitating cuts in U.S. support for the U.N. In recent days there has been a series of intemperate remarks about the U.N., going so far as to question whether it should remain in the United States. These comments have been unfortunate, it seems to me, in all respects but one, namely that they do provide an opportunity for reflection on the underlying causes of the problem and the true attitudes of the American people.

I should like at this point to read to the subcommittee a brief statement on these issues by six former Secretaries of State, seven former United States Permanent Representatives to the U.N., and two former National Security Advisers:

"The United Nations is an important instrumentality in the conduct of American foreign policy. Our experience, both in our public and private roles, has brought this home to us. The United Nations provides this country with a forum for protecting and promoting our own interests as well as for seeking solutions to problems we share with other countries. It is appropriate as well that this country should be the site of the United Nations, given the vision that has guided us as a nation and given the role we play, on all levels, in the world today. We all recognize the shortcomings of the United Nations, but we live in a very imperfect and increasingly dangerous world and we must make the best use possible of whatever means we have for managing the problems that beset us."

Those who have authorized me to make this statement on their behalf include Alexander M. Haig, Henry A. Kissinger, Edmund Muskie, William P. Rogers, Dean Rusk, Cyrus Vance, former National Security Advisers Zbigniew Brzezinski, Brent Scowcroft, and former U.N. Ambassadors George Ball, Arthur Goldberg, Donald McHenry, Daniel P. Moynihan, John Scali, William Scranton, and Andrew Young. Needless to say, I heartily concur with the sentiments of this distinguished bipartisan group.

For my own remarks here today, I shall begin with some comments on the location of the United Nations in the United States. It is generally accepted that President Roosevelt pressed to have the headquarters of the UN in this country because he wanted to do all that he could to thwart efforts by American isolationists—of whom there seems always to be a vocal if not large contingent—to keep the U.S. from joining the organization. But that is history. What is more important is that there are good reasons today for keeping the UN headquarters here. Some of them are practical—the UN contributes about $700 million to the New York area economy alone, nearly as much as the U.S. portion of the entire UN budget. In addition, UN development programs spend substantial sums for U.S. goods and services.

Secondly, it is useful to the U.S. to have delegates from virtually every country in the world experience American society at firsthand. Those of us who have genuine confidence in the strength and attractiveness of our system can only welcome this unique opportunity to impress the rest of the world.

What I believe to be the most important considerations, however, are less tangible. This country is the proper site for the preeminent world organization because of the role America plays in the world. The United States is not just the leader of a

coalition, not just a leader of a certain group of countries that share our values and political system, it is the leading country in the entire world community. It is regarded as such by all, though the fact may not always be admitted or rejoiced in. As such it is our proper function and our responsibility to be the home of the United Nations.

We should all recognize, however, that the argument is not really about the site of the UN. It is about the organization itself, and our relationship to it, and in turn it is about how we see ourselves in relation to the rest of the world and how we believe the problems we face should be dealt with.

To some extent, of course, the thought that the UN might take itself elsewhere reflects exasperation at criticism by others, and it evaporates with the first sober thought about what the UN means for us. As such, it is inconsequential. At another level, however, it reflects the persistent presence in this country of a narrow nationalism that once was called isolationism. Although it has long been a feature of the American political scene, it is not a characteristically American viewpoint. It is a form of ideology, and we are a people who have generally shunned ideology, and who developed pragmatism to a fine art. It emphasizes fear and suspicion of the outside world, and we are a people who have thrived on confidence and an openness to the rest of the world. It is at heart a rejection of cooperative ways of dealing with problems, while no people in the world has prided itself more, or with more reason, on knowing how to make things work by cooperative effort.

The rallying point for this narrow viewpoint is hostility to the United Nations, though it is not the UN itself that is fundamentally at issue. Like other attempts to adjust to the realities of global interdependence, the UN is the target of a sense of frustration and resentment. These feelings spring from a number of simplistic assumptions, all of them wrong:

That the U.S. is still consistently able, as we like to think it once was, to protect and promote its own interests solely by its own efforts;

That organized, multilateral means of solving or dealing with problems are not only in the main unnecessary, but are to be distrusted; and

That unilateralism is forced on us by an essentially hostile world.

This is a crippling vision of the world for a superpower with global responsibilities. Whether we like it or not, our fate is indissolubly bound up with the actions of countries with different economic, political and social systems, as well as with other developed Western countries. In today's world, scarely an important American interest, and no serious threat to our well-being, is within our power to manage or control by ourselves or with a few friends. Native American pragmatism, faced with that reality, would see only one sensible course—to employ every available means, including the use of multilateral organizations, to bring to bear on these concerns the joint efforts of the countries necessary to their successful management.

Fortunately, the American people continue to show the common sense and pragmatism they are known for. A public opinion poll conducted this past summer by the Roper Organization for the United Nations Association demonstrates once again that a clear majority of the public believes that the UN is important, that the U.S. should maintain or increase its participation in it, and that the organization is a place where we can hope to work out acceptable solutions to important problems. Only a small minority characterizes the UN—as do the neo-isolationists—as an anti-American organization where a hostile majority consistently comes to decisions against U.S. interests. Roughly the same number (19 percent) would have the U.S. give highest priority to answering attacks on their country in the UN rather than on working for agreements on major global issues.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit the poll results and their analysis for the record, since I believe they are significant and relevant to this discussion. Let me here note a few of them that are most indicative.

When they were asked which of three statements came closest to their feelings about the UN today, by far the greatest number (49 percent) agreed that "Although the US is frequently outvoted, enough common ground exists on most issues for the US to work within the UN." Asked whether the UN should be given more power or less power to cope with seven major global issues, 67 percent wanted the UN to have more power to deal with reducing the superpower confrontation and with supporting human rights, 64 percent advocated giving it more power to conserve natural resources, and 55 percent wanted to UN to do more to help poor countries develop. On none of the issues were more voices heard for lessening UN power than for increasing it.

The public response was realistic both in its appreciation of the UN's usefulness and in its awareness that the UN is far from perfect. Forty-six percent thought the UN was doing a good or fairly good job; 42 percent thought it was doing a bad job (a

more favorable rating, incidentally, than in a 1980 poll commissioned by UNA-USA). At the same time, 57 percent wanted the U S. to increase its participation or leave it at present levels, against 25 percent who wanted it decreased. Just over half believed the U.S. should exercise more control over how its money is used by withholding part of our financial support when the UN does things we disagree with.

These mixed and discriminating responses reveal a thoughtful appreciation of the U.N. and the very mixed bag of a world it reflects. What the public seems to be saying in its pragmatic way is that there are critical problems the U.S. cannot deal with alone, that the U.N. can help deal with them, and that we should not get too upset about the rhetoric. On the other hand, the public also seems to be saying that the U.N. is not dealing adequately with these problems. The poll results speak of increasing the U.N.'s powers. This translates, in part, into an increased commitment by the member governments to use the U.N. for solving problems. It also means finding ways to make the organizations that constitute the U.N. system work better, as well as devising new means to address new or changing problems.

The focus of debate in this country about the U.N. should be on these practical issues. It too seldom is. We are diverted from serious purposes by such irrelevancies as petulant comments about the U.N.'s presence in this country. Not nearly enough creativity and energy is being expended on generating policies that will shape the institutional means to meet future crisis. The United Nations Association of the USA has underway a major new program designed to produce ideas and propose constructive courses of action. It will make an important contribution in itself, but should also stimulate a wider effort in the universities, public affairs institutions, and the Government. There are few tasks more urgent.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you, Ambassador Richardson, for an excellent statement.

Senator Kassebaum's amendment seeks to control increases in the budget of the United Nations and several of its specialized agencies. Do you believe growth has been unwarranted? To the extent growth has been excessive, what do you believe the U.S. responsibilities should be?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would say, first of all, Mr. Chairman, that there may have been some excessive growth in the past. The rate of growth has significantly slowed. The U.S. assessment cut by the Senate vote in response to Senator Kassebaum's amendment would have resulted in an increase in the U.S. share of only $1 million in fiscal year 1984 over fiscal year 1983. The total was increased by $64 million but all but $1 million of that was simply to catch up with the arrears in the U.S. share of previous years' budgets.

The United States, Great Britain, France, and the U.S.S.R. have, in fact, had considerable success in achieving restraints. Moreover, the Secretary General of the United Nations has recently appointed a group internal to the United Nations to conduct its own review of possible opportunities for tightening the administration of the United Nations and overcoming some of its bureaucratic unwieldiness.

So I think, therefore, that the United States should continue to encourage maximum feasible economy and efficiency in U.N. administration. It should participate vigorously in the internal legislative process of the United Nations which determines its budget, in the same way that the national budgets are determined, and once that process has been concluded, once we have been heard, we should then fulfill our obligations under the Charter to pay our assessed share.

As comments by members of this subcommittee made clear in colloquy with Senator Kassebaum, the United States pays a smaller share of its total gross national product for its U.N. assessment than do other countries. I think it is a fallacy to assume that be-

cause the absolute amount we pay is larger than small countries pay, that it hurts them less than it hurts us for them to pay their shares. Indeed, they have an economy that generates far less surplus in terms of the amounts needed for anything but necessities than we do.

I think, with all due respect, that the United States is scarcely in a position to cite internal domestic needs as a reason for the relatively petty reductions that we are talking about here. The annual increase in real disposable income in the United States in the last 10 years has averaged two or three times the total per capita income of more than 1,800 million of the world's population.

Mr. YATRON. Will the Kassebaum amendment help or hurt the United States in attaining its foreign policy objectives?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think it will hurt, Mr. Chairman. I think it undercuts the position of the United States as a leader in addressing world problems under law in accordance with arrangements mutually agreed to among concerned states. The U.N. budget process is the process administered pursuant to the Charter, and I think whatever weakens respect for legal institutions on a worldwide scale is, in the long term, counterproductive to enduring U.S. interests.

Mr. YATRON. What specific impact on U.S. programs do you anticipate if the Kassebaum rollback becomes law?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the answer to that, Mr. Chairman, would depend on the kinds of conjectures about where the cuts would be applied which were addressed just a while ago. I don't know how to guess where the cuts would be made, and, of course, as Mr. Zschau's questions point out, a lot depends on whether or not other countries felt that they were free to follow the example of the United States in deciding what fraction of their own assessments they would pay.

If, as he conjectured, half of the other countries followed suit, of course the result would be seriously crippling.

Now, among the agencies whose budgets would be cut, pursuant to the Kassebaum amendment, are agencies whose effectiveness is important to us, particularly the World Health Organization, Food and Agricultural Organization, to a degree perhaps, ILO and UNESCO, but these two are important.

The United States, it is fair to say, more than any other country, has a paramount, overriding interest in global stability because we are rich and relatively comfortable, because we have no territorial ambitions, because we are not an aggressor. It is not in our interest to allow destabilizing processes to gather momentum. We should be concerned, therefore, with the sources of instability that derive from hunger, deprivation, a sense of injustice. I think that the United States is acting inconsistently not only with its interest but its national character not to continue to take leadership in addressing that kind of problem. I also think it is pathetic and unfortunate that, although our actual wealth is perhaps twice what it was per capita in the Eisenhower administration, our present share or fraction of national product devoted to any form of official aid is now only about one-eighth of what it was then.

Mr. YATRON. Ambassador Richardson, one of the frequent complaints about the United Nations is that salaries in the Secretariat

are about 25 percent higher than the U.S. civil service. Would you care to comment on that particular issue?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, yes, I would be glad to, Mr. Chairman. In the first place, I would like to correct the record. The salary figures that Senator Kassebaum submitted to the subcommittee were identified as being after taxes. Actually, they are before taxes and so should be considered in that context.

But, I am happy to address the proposition from the standpoint that I believe that U.S. Government salaries, including those of Members of Congress, have been held down far too stringently over the past decade. They have nowhere near kept pace with inflation.

I came into the U.S. executive branch in 1956 and I have worked in six departments, in nine Presidential appointments, with a great many dedicated public servants. These include individuals in all of the uniform services, and I would add not only to those in the Pentagon, but U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Public Health Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration service. I think that the United States is suffering now from the inability to retain civil servants in senior positions.

I think that this is an unfortunate byproduct of the circumstance that Congress for its own political reasons feels unable to maintain its own salaries at appropriate levels. So I can only say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I hope you will regard the United Nations as having set a good example.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you, Ambassador.

Mr. Leach.

Mr. LEACH. Do you see any irony, Mr. Secretary, in our objecting to the formula by which we are assessed at the United Nations when in essence the sacrifice to the United States is less than certainly any major country that I know of and probably less than many minor countries, partly because the percentage of our GNP which we contribute to the United Nations is less than the percentage of GNP many other nations pay to the United Nations and partly because we are the country that gets the greatest return on investment due to the location of the United Nations here.

You indicated a return of $700 million a year. Other indications might be slightly less than that, but certainly it is of substantial magnitude. Coupled with the fact that the United Nations buys a good deal of its goods and services from the United States, our particular assessment, in final measure, looks pretty meager compared to others. Is that a fair or false assessment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I think your comments are right on target, Congressman Leach, and I think they ought to carry substantial weight in addressing this problem. They ought to be far better understood than they are, but I think the central issue here really is one of how to deal with the question of the U.N. budget.

Congressman Bonker earlier pointed out that this subcommittee has made extensive inquiries into expenditures by the United Nations and its affiliated organizations, and that it has found these expenditures by and large justified and free of impropriety. But even if we were to assume that there is waste in the U.N. budget, certainly there are rigidities and inefficiencies in the U.S. bureaucratic structure. It still wouldn't follow, of course, that the way to

deal with this problem is by unilateral U.S. cutoffs of the kind that the Senate amendment would make effective.

It is inconsistent with the U.S. interest in adherence to the constitutional process of international organizations to go at it that way. We should be cheering on the Secretary General in the internal review now being conducted. We should perhaps urge the Secretary General to appoint a U.N. counterpart of the Grace Commission, which might be composed of people drawn from areas of expertise in administration, budgeting, and management from various countries, who could look at the questions of efficiency and economy. Then we could support such amendments as might be indicated. But for us to do it this way, particularly to do it as has been brought out here today, I think, is a serious mistake.

Mr. LEACH. I recognize you have another commitment. Let me just ask one question that gets a little bit away from the numerical issue that we have been dealing with, and that relates to the spirit of our handling of matters in the United Nations at this time. As you know, one of our representatives at the United Nations, Ambassador Lichenstein, made a comment last week, which has sparked a good deal of public interest.[1]

In your judgment, is that a kind of responsible comment, appropriate to a representative of the United States? How would you characterize the Ambassador's statement?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, I think it was what amounts, in effect, to an ill-advised wisecrack. I think it was understandable enough in the circumstance in which he uttered it. I think it was still a mistake, though understandable. But more disturbing than his statement in that context is that it tended to evoke a fairly widespread reaction that maybe it would be a good thing if they packed up and left and, of course, I did not think that Mayor Koch's statement did anything to enlighten the discussion.

Mr. LEACH. Thank you.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you, Mr. Leach.

Mr. Ambassador, we had a few more questions here but we realize that you have another commitment and we will not ask any more questions. We want to thank you very, very much for appearing here today before the subcommittee and giving us the benefit of your views and your expertise.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to say on my behalf, and on behalf of the UNA-USA, Mr. Chairman, that I warmly appreciate the opportunity to appear here today, and I might add one more word. I am pleased to be here the day after the President of the United States delivered such a powerful and eloquent statement at the United Nations in expression of the U.S. enduring interest in support for that organization.

Thank you very much.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

The subcommittee stands adjourned until the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., the subcommittee was recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.]

---

[1] See appendix 3.

THE U.S. ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1983

House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Subcommittee on Human Rights and
International Organizations,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 3 p.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Gus Yatron (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. Yatron. The subcommittee will come to order.

The steadfastness of the U.S. commitment to the United Nations was opened to serious question in recent weeks, first, as a result of comments emanating from the executive branch and, more recently, as a result of an amendment adopted overwhelmingly by the Senate.

That amendment would sharply reduce the U.S. assessed contribution to the United Nations, UNESCO, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization.

President Reagan, in his speech to the United Nations last week, forcefully and eloquently recommitted the United States to the Charter of the United Nations and the organization's noble purposes.

As the U.N. largest financial contributor, the United States clearly has a major interest in the economy and efficiency with which the United Nations is run. At the same time, the United States has a deep interest in preserving the collaborative approach to international decisionmaking which is the very essence of the U.N. system.

The Senate amendment is designed to impose on the United Nations a U.S. decision with respect to the U.N. budget over each of the next 4 fiscal years.

Moreover, the amendment, if finally approved, potentially could seriously damage the United Nations financially and set in motion a chain of events which ultimately might destroy the organization.

Last Tuesday the subcommittee heard testimony on U.S. participation in the United Nations from the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, the author of the Senate amendment.

We also heard testimony from Hon. Elliot Richardson, chairman of the United Nations Association of the United States. To continue our discussion of events which prompted this review of U.S. participation in the United Nations, we are pleased to welcome to the

32-616 O - 84 - 7

subcommittee Hon. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, we are grateful for your coming here before the subcommittee on such short notice.

At this time I would like to yield to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. Leach.

Mr. LEACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a rather long statement that I would like your permission to put in the record.

Mr. YATRON. Without objection.

Mr. LEACH. I would like to cite briefly from it. It is an anguished statement and one I feel very strongly about.

To support the United Nations is an expensive endeavor. Although we are the largest contributor, I think we should note that the United States devotes a smaller percentage of its GNP to this institution than many other countries.

In addition, we receive far more direct economic benefit, more than any other country, due to the location of the United Nations in New York.

It is estimated, in fact, that the New York area alone receives perhaps as much as $700 million a year in economic benefits from the United Nations. It thus strikes me as ironic to hear the mayor of New York, Mr. Koch, term the United Nations a cesspool and to find our representatives saying they would gladly stand at the wharf and wave goodbye to the delegates at the United Nations.

More importantly, it couldn't be more troubling to find that, at a time when the United Nations is under serious attack, the U.S. Representative to the United Nations has come to Congress, not to pour water on the fires of criticism, but instead to strike another match. Whereas the President of the United States very courageously told U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar last June that "even in a time of domestic trenchment, American financial support has not and will not decline," and, I repeat, that is a quote from the President of the United States—today our U.N. Ambassador has come to this hearing and instead of forthcomingly talking on the Kassebaum amendment, in the prepared statement that I have read, is actually urging Congress to cut back funding for the United Nations.

In 1965, Ambassador Goldberg articulated the right of the United States to selectively withhold payments to U.N. agencies which do not serve our national purpose.

To this Goldberg reservation, we have appended today the Kirkpatrick corollary, which declares the desirability of national legislatures actively attempting to pick and choose among U.N. functions and to penalize those institutions and programs which have strayed from their legitimate purposes and tasks.

This have-your-cake-and-eat-it-too diplomacy is analogous to taxpayers unilaterally reserving the right unto themselves to selectively decide where their tax payments should be utilized.

The Kirkpatrick corollary is a prescription for global anarchy and is an irresponsibility of the highest order. And when coupled with the often recommended tactic that our foreign policy should be geared toward rewarding those who are contrite at the United

Nations and penalizing those that are less so, one is left with the impression that U.S. diplomacy today is strikingly immature.

No one who follows the United Nations doubts that the problems are immense and that irrationality has become the watchword. But a fair question can be asked as to whether the policies we are invoking to achieve restraint aren't in and of themselves counterproductive.

Here it is illustrative to contrast the understated diplomatic approach of the British with the rhetorical belligerence which has crept into recent U.S. posturing.

Diplomacy by wisecrack is irresponsible. Just as James Watt's humor has ill-served the President on environmental issues, so thoughtless gibes about the desirability of the United Nations being located on a half-time basis in Moscow stand as unchivalrous bleatings from the host country's U.N. representative.

The issue is one of statesmanship, not partisanship. Nominees for President from Wendell Wilkie to Dwight Eisenhower; from Adlai Stevenson to John Kennedy would be turning in their graves if they thought there was any hint that the United States would abandon or weaken its support for the United Nations.

Where, we must ask ourselves, is old-fashioned statesmanship? It is a duty of leadership to appeal to the highest, not the lowest instincts of the body politic. The times are too calamitous to play cheap word games associated so long with the John Birch Society. The rallying cry "Get the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States" may be psychologically satisfying for some, but it is a prescription for strategic disaster.

Now, as cold war tensions have reemerged, it is particularly timely for the United States to make clear to the world that we are proud the United Nations is in the United States and that the United States is in the United Nations.

The United Nations may not have lived up to original expectations, but it is still a beacon of hope for mankind.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Leach's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JIM LEACH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

As historians recount the deeds of mankind, it appears that the scourge of war is a constant of history. From pre-biblical to post-Hiroshima times few generations have known peace. In this light, Pope John Paul II's recent warning that the world has shifted from a "post-war" to "pre-war" mentality deserves careful pondering.

Reflective of heightened tension in the world are global intrasigence on arms control and the escalation of regional conflicts from the Middle East to Central America. Against this political backdrop the recent debate about the depth of the U.S. commitment to the United Nations could not be more troubling. Sparked by an intemperate exchange between U.S. and Soviet Ambassadors in New York, two questions have been raised in the minds of many Americans: should the U.S. remain in the U.N. and should the U.N. remain in New York?

In the strongest possible way, I am convinced the answer to both questions should be "yes." Now is the time to sound the alarm bell in support of the U.N.

The issue is one of statesmanship, not partisanship. Nominees for president from Wendell Wilkie to Dwight Eisenhower, from Adlai Stevenson to John F. Kennedy, would be turning in their graves if they thought there was any hint the U.S. would abandon or weaken its support for the United Nations.

This is not to say that the U.N. has not been a disappointment, if not failure, in many instances. Even the Secretary General's latest annual report expresses deep concern over the "partial paralysis of the United Nations as the guardian of international peace and security." On the other hand, the U.N. has been effective in dealing with the crises in the Congo in 1960–64 and in the Sinai in 1973, where peacekeeping operations may have helped prevent a U.S.-Soviet confrontation. Today, U.N. peacekeeping forces or observers are present in Cyprus and Kashmir, on the Golan Heights and in Lebanon.

While on a scale of one to a hundred U.N. peacekeeping efforts might only earn a mark in the neighborhood of 10, when survival of the planet is at stake some achievements are better than none at all.

Frequently the U.N. has been criticized as having degenerated into a world debating society. This criticism has a ring of truth to it. Many citizens of the world had higher hopes for the U.N. than to see country after country use the podium of New York for political diatribe, much of it directed against the U.S. Still, all in all, words are cheaper than bullets, and who knows how much conflict such open discussion of issues prevents.

In cost terms, the most expensive part of the U.N. is not the maintenance of the General Assembly and Security Council. Rather, it is the support to its specialized agencies like the United Nations Education and Social Council (UNESCO) and the World Health Organization (WHO). Here, any neutral assessment of the U.N. must be generous. The U.N. High Commission on Refugees is a recent recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize; WHO is largely responsible for eradicating smallpox from the vast majority of countries of the world; UNESCO has broadened the education and cultural opportunities for millions of impoverished children; the International Atomic Energy Agency has established safeguard and inspection systems to insure against nuclear non-proliferation.

And, perhaps most importantly, in the area of arms control U.N.-affiliated institutions have worked to advance treaties ranging from the demilitarization of Antarctica and outer space to restraints on the development, production and stockpiling of biochemical weapons. Arms control, we must constantly remind ourselves, is not an exclusive U.S.-Soviet concern. International efforts and safeguards will be increasingly necessary to preserve international peace and prevent nuclear holocaust.

To support the U.N. is expensive, but although we are its largest contributor, the U.S. devotes a smaller portion of our GNP to support the world's foremost international institution than many other countries. In addition, we receive far more direct economic benefit than any other country due to the location of the U.N. in New York. It is estimated, in fact, that New York City alone receives almost $700 million yearly in economic benefits from the U.N.

It thus could not be more ironic to hear New York Mayor Ed Koch term the U.N. a "cesspool" and find our representatives saying they would gladly stand at the wharf and wave goodbye to delegates.

More importantly, it could not be more troubling to find at a time the U.N. is under attack that the U.S. representative has come to Congress not to pour water on the fires of criticism but instead to strike another match. Whereas the President of the United States courageously told Secretary General Perez de Cuellar last June that "even in a time of domestic trenchment [sic] American financial support has not and will not decline," Ambassador Kirkpatrick has come to this hearing and instead of taking on the Kassebaum amendment, actually urged Congress to cut funding for the United Nations.

In response to East Bloc withholding of funds to the U.N., Ambassador Arthur Goldberg in 1965 articulated the right of the U.S. to selectively withhold payments to U.N. agencies which do not serve our national purpose. To this Goldberg reservation we have appended the "Kirkpatrick Corollary," which declares the desirability of national legislatures to attempt actively to pick and choose between U.N. functions and to "penalize" those institutions and programs which have "strayed from their legitimate purposes and tasks."

This "have-your-cake-and-eat-it-too diplomacy" is analogous to taxpayers unilaterally reserving the right unto themselves to selectively decide where their tax payments should be utilized. The Kirkpatrick Corollary is a prescription for global anarchy and is an irresponsibility of the highest order. And, when coupled with the often-recommended tactic that our foreign policy should be geared toward rewarding those who are contrite at the U.N. and penalizing those who are less so, one is left with the impression that U.S. diplomacy today is strikingly immature.

No one who follows the United Nations doubts that the problems are immense and that irrationality has beome the watchword. But a fair question can be asked as to whether the policies we are invoking to achieve restraint aren't in and of them-

selves counterproductive. Here it is illustrative to contrast the understated diplomatic approach of the British with the rehetorical belligerence which has crept into recent U.S. posturing.

Diplomacy by wisecrack is irresponsible. Just as James Watt's humor has ill-served his President on environmental issues, so thoughtless gibes about the desirability of the U.N. being located on a half-time basis in Moscow stand as unchivalrous bleatings from the host country's U.N. representative.

Where, we must ask ourselves, is old-fashioned statesmanship? It is the duty of leadership to appeal to the highest, not the lowest, instincts of the body politic. The times are too calamitous to play the cheap word games associated so long with the John Birch Society. The rallying cry "Get the U.S. out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the U.S." may be psychologically satisfying for some, but it is a prescription for strategic disaster.

Americans must recognize that the United States will never again hold as great a percentage of the world's economic and military might as it did at the end of World War II. Hence, in a very practical sense our national security demands that greater emphasis and sensitivity be applied to relations between states and to major international institutions such as the United Nations. Responsible governments have an obligation to seek to strengthen rather than deprecate the U.S. and its sister organizations.

At the insistence of Woodrow Wilson, the League of Nations was created in the aftermath of World War I. Yet, with Wilson's illness and death, narrow isolationism took hold in the United States and we refused to join the League, thus contributing to the unstable peace from which the second world war developed.

By a narrow 25-to-23 vote the decision was made in 1945 to locate the U.N. in America rather than Europe, partly out of respect to the greatest democracy in the world, partly out of fear that the United States would turn inward and again deny its global responsibilities. Now, as the Cold War tensions have reemerged, it is particularly timely for the United States to make clear to the world that we are proud the U.N. is in the U.S. and the U.S. is in the U.N. The United Nations may not have lived up to original expectations, but it is still a beacon of hope for mankind.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you, Mr. Leach.

Now, at this time I would like to call on the gentleman from California, Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I did not intend to make an opening statement, but in view of my colleague's opening statement, I am constrained to do so.

If you people have represented the United States in international fora with the integrity, intelligence, effectiveness, and eloquence of Ambassador Kirkpatrick, and I believe that my good friend from Iowa has overreacted in a manner which is uncharacteristic of him, and if I may be as bold as to suggest, inexcusable.

To use the term John Birch Society in welcoming our Ambassador to the United Nations to the hearing of this subcommittee, I think is unacceptable.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, with whom I have had some agreements and some disagreements on a variety of issues, has been exemplary in her commitment to open and free societies and in her unflinching struggle for democratic nations within the U.N. structure.

I believe we will have plenty of opportunity this afternoon to explore the recent hub-bub concerning the United Nations, but I think it would be wholly unrealistic for this subcommittee not to recognize that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction abroad and in the land concerning many of the activities of the United Nations, many of the statements of U.N. representatives from many countries, and while the American people are fundamentally in support of the United Nations, and in support of the United Nations continuing its presence in the United States, I, for one, believe that

while from a pragmatic point of view this will not come about, it will be enormously salutory for the vast majority of the representatives in most States to spend half the time in the Soviet Union because they would then, on a firsthand basis, obtain a realistic opportunity to engage in comparative judgments concerning Soviet society and American society.

That will not come about. It will not come about because the overwhelming majority of the delegates would vigorously oppose moving the United Nations out of the United States because they like it in New York, and much as they complain, they would hate to have the U.N. headquarters anyplace else.

But I do believe that both the President and Ambassador Lichtenstein spoke for the vast majority of the American people in expressing a profound sense of frustration with many of the statements and activities emanating from the glass edifice on the East River.

I personally believe that we should remain in the United Nations. I personally believe we should contribute our fair share to the U.N. activities. And, by fair share I mean the same proportion of U.N. funding that our gross national product warrants, not more and not less.

I personally believe that the United Nations will continue to be headquartered in New York, but I think it does none of us any good to attack the distinguished representative of the United States in that international body. Ambassador Kirkpatrick has done a remarkable job of representing this Nation as our Ambassador to the United Nations, and I personally look forward to listening to her testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you, Mr. Lantos.

Now, I would like to call on the gentleman from New York, Mr. Solomon, for an opening statement.

Mr. SOLOMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had not intended to make an opening statement, but I am moved to do so in light of some of the, what I consider, rather scurrilous remarks by one of my colleagues, whether intentional or unintentional.

Let me just say at the outset that I do nothing but heap praise on you, Madame Ambassador. You are not only eloquent, but you are most effective and we in the United States appreciate that.

As far as President Reagan and his foreign policy are concerned, I can recall back when I was in Congress and we had other Presidents, not just Democrats, but Republicans as well, and our foreign policy was the laughingstock around the world.

Well, our foreign policy today is not a laughingstock, thanks to Ronald Reagan and his administration.

My colleagues refer to some remarks made by Mayor Koch about a cesspool, and you know, sometimes we have to judge remarks people make and the organization they belong to by what they say. And if it sounds like a cesspool, you call it a cesspool.

As far as our contribution to the United Nations is concerned, relative to GNP, one member has said that it is a very small percentage compared to other countries. I come from the old school myself. I am 100 percent Scottish and I have worked for every

nickel I ever had in my life. I am proud of what I have, and I don't believe in sharing the wealth with anybody.

I don't believe in having whatever little money I have taken away from me so my family can't have it. That is what America was all about. If we are going to do anything, and this is the hallmark of the Reagan foreign policy, it is to teach people to help themselves. That is exactly what President Reagan's foreign policy is.

I intend to offer an amendment, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, at the appropriate time, to whatever legislation comes on the floor of the House, which would require you—not that you wouldn't want to do it anyway—to record the voting records and the statements that are made in the General Assembly and the Security Council and all the other U.N. agencies to let the Congress know what other countries are saying about us.

I don't say that we will use that to determine our bilateral aid or multilateral contributions, but you can bet that these other countries will continue to hold their hands out. For example, Mr. Mugabe from Zimbabwe, who abstained on a vote on the KAL airliner tragedy and then comes to Washington the next week with his hand out.

I, for one, and many others like me, intend to take those things into consideration. That amendment will pass both Houses, will become law and will require the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to give us those records which we will forward to every office that we have in every country. We will take those things into consideration.

I guess I had better stop. I have some questions of you, but I will ask them at the appropriate time.

Mr. YATRON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, please proceed with your opening statement.

STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK, U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Thank you very much.

I would like to say, as always, I am honored and pleased to appear before this subcommittee of Congress.

I believe very deeply in the important role of Congress in the formulation and the oversight of U.S. foreign policy.

I should like to make clear at the outset that I respect the institution in which I represent the United States, and have the highest regard for the integrity and skill of Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar and his principal lieutenants, and that I believe that effective U.S. participation in the United Nations is an important aspect of our foreign policy.

I also fully share the Congress concern with the spiraling growth of the U.N. budget and bureaucracy, and the frustration and conviction expressed in the Senate's overwhelming vote, that the United States should not simply acquiesce in this seemingly uncontrolled process.

The U.N. budget has nearly tripled in the last decade, during which inflation in the United States amounted to about 115 per-

cent. And even in this statist age it is difficult to find a government whose bureaucracy has grown at rates that equal that of this U.N. bureaucracy during the last decade.

We in the Reagan administration have tried hard to slow this rampant growth. I believe that our predecessors also worked hard to control the growth of the U.N. budget.

I believe that Secretary General de Cuellar is working hard on this problem.

He has, in fact, undertaken a major economy campaign which may bear fruit this year, but none of our efforts could have reasonably been called successful as of the end of the fiscal year 1983. The budget continued to grow, and at a very unacceptable rate.

Now, various factors I believe are involved in that growth of the U.N. budget. One certainly is worldwide inflation; another, and a very important one to take into account, is the increasing peacekeeping operation of the United Nations. About one-third of the U.S. assessment is spent for peacekeeping. Each of these have played their role, but fundamentally the problems of U.N. budget growth are structural. They derive from the fact that the budget is finally determined by a majority of members that can add on and on and on without themselves incurring the brunt of the additional costs.

Specifically 85 member states of the 157 total membership in the last fiscal year—we now have 158 with the addition of St. Christopher-Nevis, but 85 of that 157 pay a total of only 1.75 percent of the budget, while the United States, which pays 25 percent, has only 1/157th of the decisionmaking power, or we can say the Soviet Union, which pays 14 percent, has 1/157th of the decisionmaking power.

Responsibility for financing the United Nations is thus, in effect, vested in a very small minority of its richest and most powerful members, while authority to control the budget lies with the voting majority.

From this distribution, this disjunction of power and responsibility flows the fact that those countries who have the votes don't pay the bills, while those who pay the bills don't have the votes.

Last year's experiences seem to be a case study that illustrates the problem and its tenacity.

We need to be aware, first, that the process of budgetmaking features input from the various sections of the U.N. Secretariat, which the Secretary General requests some 18 months in advance of his own recommendations. He gets input from the General Assembly in the form of resolutions which mandate new activities, review by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, review by the Committee for Programs and Coordination, review by the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, and then by the Plenary.

At the very beginning of this administration's term, in April 1981, we secured the agreement of the so-called Geneva Group, that is, Western-oriented donors contributing 10 percent or more to the budgets of the specialized agencies, that for the first half of the 1980's, real budgetary growth should be zero, with the understanding that some of the cost increases due to inflation and exchange rate losses would have to be absorbed.

We collaborated as well with the U.S.S.R. which shares our concern with controlling costs. Demarches were made to the heads of the major U.N. agencies, stressing that priorities must be established and that marginal or obsolete programs must be terminated.

At the 37th General Assembly, we confronted headon the problem of add-ons. We, the United States, demanded a vote wherever and whenever a financial resolution had financial implications and voted against all resolutions and decisions which increased the U.N. budget without offsetting economies, unless there was some compelling political, humanitarian, or fiscal reason to the contrary.

There is not much doubt our campaign encouraged more attention to priorities and gave added urgency to the determination of Secretary General Perez de Cuellar to control too rapid budget growth.

In sending out his guidelines for the 1984–85 biennium, the Secretary General stressed that maximum fiscal restraint was required of all elements.

All submissions of the several U.N. departments and agencies are now examined by a Program Planning and Budgeting Board, of which Perez himself is the Chairman.

The new Board also monitors and evaluates the functioning of the Secretariat itself.

I may say that I regard this move by the Secretary General as a very important and promising one.

In addition, in August Secretary General Perez de Cuellar commissioned a separate study of the Secretariat, its management systems and techniques, and such questions as staffing pattern, simplification of procedures, delegation of authority, and so forth.

The report is due early in 1984.

The Secretary General and his principal associates has written to assure me he will undertake special measures and studies to streamline, modernize, and reduce costs in areas of U.N. functioning, such as travel, telecommunications, and the preparation and production of documents.

He is determined, he assures me, to bring under control the portions of the budget susceptible to his control.

I have included in an appendix a memorandum which the Secretariat provided to me on measures which they have taken, since the tenure of the new Secretary General began in January 1982, to enhance the efficiency of the United Nations.

In the last fiscal year, neither our efforts nor those of all those with whom we work, including the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, Japan, West Germany, and Israel and the Solomon Islands, and so forth, none of us voted for the budget.

The final vote was 120 for the budget, 15 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

Taken together, the 120 nations who voted for the budget probably contribute no more than 15 to 20 percent, or less than that, of the total assessed budget.

There is no escaping the fact that our efforts have not been successful.

Nor is there any escaping the fact that salaries and fringe benefits of U.N. employees are high compared to those of United States

and other governments and continue to rise; that conferences proliferate, and costs continue to increase.

We cannot guarantee either that the efforts of the Secretariat or of the United States and the other nations that share our concern will achieve the desired results because effective control over the budget is vested in and exercised by a solid majority whose members, 88 countries, pay less than 2 percent of the budget.

The result last year is typical. Not 1 of the top 10 contributing countries—whose combined contributions pay some 75 percent of the U.N. expenses—voted for the budget.

Either they voted against or they abstained. Obviously they were dissatisfied.

Fourteen of the top 15 contributors whose combined contributions comprise some 85 percent of the budget either voted against or abstained.

What can the U.S. Congress do in this situation to control the costs to us, and to insure that international organizations which we help finance, operate on a basis of responsible budgetary restraint?

I believe this question is important and urgent. The initiative of Senator Kassebaum and her colleagues offers one approach to this question.

In discussing the question and possible approaches to it, I desire to make three points:

First the U.S. Government has total control over its voluntary contributions to the U.N. specialized agencies. Those voluntary contributions exceed the assessed contributions.

Second, although this is a controversial subject, I desire to make clear that I do not believe the U.S. treaty obligation to contribute 25 percent of the assessed budget is absolute.

It is sometimes argued that as signatories to the treaty, we assume an absolute legal obligation to pay the assessed share of the budget, it seems to me, after consultation and reflection, that this obligation is real, substantial, and serious, but also that it is not absolute.

It exists as part of a web of obligations, some of which are vested in other members, and some in the organization. It is integrally linked to understandings about the functions of this organization and the purposes to which the contributions will be devoted.

Moreover, 30 countries withhold, as a matter of announced policy, portions of their assessed budgets and incur no penalties.

I have included an appendix which states the estimated cumulative withholding by U.N. member states as a matter of announced policy.

I do not suggest the United States should take lightly the obligation to pay its assessed share of the budget. This is a serious, but not, in my opinion, an absolute obligation. To be sure, article 17 of the U.N. Charter requires member states to pay their share of the U.N. budget as assessed by the General Assembly. We should not assume, however, that any expense apportioned by the General Assembly is automatically valid.

To create collective obligations to pay, the expense must be legitimate.

As you know, Congress has for a number of years required that the United States withhold the pro rata share of its assessed and

voluntary contributions which go either to the two U.N. committees on Palestinian rights or which go to support U.N. activities on behalf of the PLO, Cuba, or SWAPO.

In each of these instances, we have deemed the activities of these entities to be in contravention of the basic principles and purposes of the U.N. Charter and, accordingly, have withheld payment.

For related reasons, President Reagan announced last year that the United States would withhold from its assessed U.N. contribution our share of the expenses associated with implementation of the Law of the Sea Treaty, which we determined to not properly be subject to assessment.

As I have already said, 30 countries already withhold parts of their U.N. assessments for activities they deem improper. The largest withholding by far has occurred by the Soviet bloc states which have withheld more than $260 million.

Almost all of this withholding has been from U.N. peacekeeping operations. This withholding has been determined by the International Court of Justice, in the *Certain Expenses* case of 1962, to be in clear contravention of the U.N. Charter since peacekeeping operations are an essential and thus permissible U.N. activity tied to the U.N. primary purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

This is in marked contrast to the withholding patterns of other states, including the U.S., where the legitimacy of the activity not supported is open to serious question and where no adverse ICJ ruling exists.

In this context, U.S. withholding in protest would not constitute a deviation from our traditional support for the principles of collective financial responsibility for legitimate U.N. expenses. Nor does such limited selective withholding damage the fiscal order of the U.N. by encouraging other nations to engage in selective withholding. They already are doing that and began long before the U.S., pursuant to congressional directives, started to engage in this practice.

Because withholding for legitimate U.N. expenses had by 1965 become a way of life for the Soviet bloc, the U.S. at that time announced, with the full knowledge and acquiescence of Congress, what has come to be known as the Goldberg Reservation.

That declaration reserves for the U.S. the right to follow the practices of others in selective withholding.

As stated by Ambassador Goldberg in 1965:

> * * * if any member can insist on making an exception to the principle of collective financial responsibility with respect to certain activities of the organization, the U.S. reserves the same option to make exceptions to the principles of collective financial responsibility if, in our view, strong and compelling reasons exist for doing so. There can be no double standard among the members of the organization.

Justice Goldberg, in response to a recent inquiry from me—at the time, the Law of the Sea Preparatory Conference was under consideration—wrote that it was his considered conclusion that:

> * * * there can be no question that under the Goldberg Reservation the U.S. reserves the right to withhold assessments for U.N. activities which, in our opinion, do not serve our national purpose.

I may say that is a Goldberg corollary, not a Kirkpatrick corollary.

The third point I would like to make, I would encourage the Congress, in its desire to exercise greater control over U.S. contributions and expenditures, to distinguish between U.N. operations and programs which U.S. taxpayers support and those they do not.

We should set priorities and make choices in ways that favor programs which are consistent with our values, and that favor agencies which pursue the purposes for which they were established.

We should penalize those which, because of politicization and/or inefficiency, have strayed from their legitimate purposes and tasks.

We might, for example, reasonably decide to register firmly through fiscal means, our profound disapproval of UNESCO, which has succumbed to politicization, which creates obstacles to a free press instead of promoting free exchange of information, discriminates against one of its members, Israel, and which is utterly indifferent to principles of fiscal restraint and good management.

It seems to me to be undesirable to impose identical cuts on the Secretariat as a whole when the Secretary General has undertaken a major effort to bring expenses under control and to enhance efficiency, or on the World Health Organization which practices sound management and whose ongoing contributions to eradicating disease are well known.

In thinking about cuts, we should also distinguish between discretionary items in the assessed budget, such as the number of employees and their salary levels, and nondiscretionary items such as peacekeeping acivities.

While we might want to reduce, perhaps even drastically reduce or eliminate entirely our contributions to one agency, we might well want to expand the other.

Congress oversight responsibilities vis-a-vis U.S. funding of the U.N. requires constant vigilance of all U.N. activities, whether funded through our assessed or voluntary contributions, to determine their compatibility with the fundamental objectives and principles of the U.N. Charter.

Let me say that this administration's commitment to working inside the U.N. to achieve those fundamental objectives and principles of the U.N. Charter has been repeatedly reaffirmed.

However, since our voluntary contributions exceed our assessed contributions and as there are no binding restraints regarding such contributions, I recommend that if Congress is concerned principally about economy, it makes sense to start there, and afterward to move agency by agency through the assessed contributions.

In this regard I would like to respectfully suggest to this committee, as I have done in the past in testimony before other congressional committees, that the U.S. consider adopting the practice of many other large voluntary contributors of earmarking our funds to specific agencies and for specific projects.

Thus we would reward the specialized agencies which do work of which we approve and discontinue or reduce our funding of agencies which engage in practices we do not endorse.

In conclusion, I want to stress how deeply I believe in the importance of closer congressional oversight. By working cooperatively together, I think we both can better fulfill our own responsibilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Ambassador Kirkpatrick's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK, U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, as always, I am very honored to appear before a committee of the Congress to discuss the UN budget and U.S. contributions. As I have said on many occasions I believe very deeply in the important role of Congress in the formulation and oversight of U.S. foreign policy.

As I understand it, I have been asked to testify today on U.N. budget, the U.S. contribution to the United Nations and its various agencies. I am further sensitive to the fact that the Senate has voted decisively in support of the substantial cuts proposed in the so-called Kassebaum amendment.

I should like to make clear at the outset that I respect the institution in which I represent the United States, and have the highest regard for the integrity and skill of the Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar and his principal lieutenants, and that I believe that effective U.S. participation in the U.N. is an important aspect of our foreign policy.

I also fully share the Congress' concern with the spiraling growth of the U.N. budget and bureaucracy, and the frustration and conviction, expressed in the Senate's lopsided vote, that the U.S. should not simply acquiesce in this seemingly uncontrolled process. The U.N. budget has nearly tripled in the last decade (a decade during which inflation in the United States amounted to about 115 percent). And even in this statist age it is difficult to find a government whose bureaucracy has grown at rates that equal that of this U.N. bureaucracy during the last decade.

We in the Reagan Administration have tried hard to slow this rampant growth. The record makes clear, I believe, that our predecessors also worked to control the growth of the U.N. budget. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has undertaken a major economy campaign which may bear fruit this year but none of our efforts could have been called successful as of the end of the 1983 fiscal year. The budget continues to grow.

Various factors have caused the U.N. budget to grow: worldwide inflation and increased peacekeeping operations (about ⅓ of the U.S. assessment is spent for peacekeeping), each have played their role, but fundamentally, the problems of U.N. budget growth are structural. They derive from the fact that the budget is finally determined by a majority of members that can add on and on and on without themselves incurring the brunt of the additional costs. Specifically, 85 member states of the 157 total membership in the last fiscal year pay a total of only 1.75 percent of the budget, while the U.S., which pays 25 percent has only 1/157th of the decision-making power. Responsibility for financing the U.N. is thus in effect vested in a very small minority of its richest and most powerful members while authority to control the budget lies with the voting majority. From this distribution of power and responsibility flows the fact that those countries who have the votes don't pay the bills, while those who pay the bills don't have the votes.

Last year's experiences can be seen as a case study that illustrates the problem and its tenacity.

The process of budget making features input from the various sections of the U.N. Secretariat, imput from the General Assembly in the form of resolutions which mandate new activities, review by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) (where the budget is usually cut), review by the Committee for Programs and Coordination (where the budget is usually increased), review by the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, and then by the Plenary.

At the very beginning of the Administration's term, in April 1981, we secured the agreement of the so-called "Geneva Group" (that is, Western oriented donors contributing one percent or more to the budgets of the specialized agencies) that for the first half of the 1980s, real budgetary growth should be zero, with the understanding that some of the cost increases due to inflation and exchange rate losses would have to be absorbed. We collaborated as well with the U.S.S.R. which shares our concern with controlling costs. Demarches were made to the heads of the major UN agencies, stressing that priorities must be established and that marginal or obsolete programs must be terminated.

At the 37th General Assembly, we confronted head on the problem of add-ons. We demanded a vote wherever and whenever a resolution had financial implications and voted against all resolutions and decisions which increased the UN budget without offsetting economies, unless there was some compelling political, humanitarian or fiscal reason to the contrary. There is not much doubt our campaign encouraged more attention to priorities and gave added urgency to the determination of Secretary General Perez de Cuellar to control too rapid budget growth.

In sending out his guidelines for the 1984–85 biennium, the Secretary General stressed that "maximum fiscal restraint" was required of all elements. All submissions of the several UN departments and agencies are now examined by a Program Planning and Budgeting Board of which Perez himself is the chairman. The new board also monitors and evaluates the functioning of the Secretariat itself. In addition, in August Secretary General Perez de Cuellar commissioned a separate study of the Secretariat, its management systems and techniques, and such questions as staffing pattern, simplification of procedures, delegation of authority, etc. The report is due early in 1984.

The Secretary General has written to assure me he will undertake special measures and studies to streamline, modernize and reduce costs in areas of UN functioning such as travel, telecommunications, and the preparation and production of documents. He is determined, he assures me, to bring under control the portions of the budget susceptible to his control. (See Appendix item A. "Some measures taken since 1 January 1982 to enhance the efficiency of the United Nations.")

We voted against the 1982–83 budget, as did the UK, Japan, West Germany, Israel, the Solomon Islands, the Soviet Union and eight of its allies. Nevertheless, the final vote was 120 for the budget, 15 opposed and 6 abstentions. Taken together, the 120 nations who voted for the budget probably contribute no more than 15–20% of the total assessed budget. There is no escaping the fact our efforts have not been successful. Nor is there any escaping the fact that salaries and fringe benefits of UN employees are high compared to those of U.S. and other governments and continue to rise, that conferences proliferate and costs continue to increase.

We cannot guarantee either that the efforts of the Secretariat or of the U.S. and the other nations that share our concern will achieve the desired results because effective control over the budget is exercised by a solid majority whose members (88 countries) pay less than two percent of the budget. The result last year is typical—not one of the top ten contributing countries (whose combined contributions pay some 74 percent of the U.N.'s expenses) voted for the budget. Either they voted against or they abstained.

What can the U.S. Congress do in this situation to control the costs to us, and to insure that international organizations which we help finance, operate on a basis of responsible budgetary restraint?

I believe this question is important and urgent. The initiative of Senator Kassebaum and her colleagues offers one approach to this question. In discussing the question and possible approaches to it, I desire to make three points:

(1) The U.S. Government has total control over its voluntary contributions to the UN's specialized agencies. Those voluntary contributions exceed the assessed contributions.

(2) Although this is a controversial subject, I desire to make clear that I do not believe the U.S. treaty obligation to contribute 25 percent of the assessed budget is absolute. It is sometimes argued that as signatories to the treaty we assume an absolute legal obligation to pay the assessed share of the budget, it seems to me, after consultation and reflection, that this obligation is real, substantial and serious, but also that it is not absolute. It exists as part of a web of obligations some of which are vested in other members, and some in the organization. It is integrally linked to understandings about the functions of this organization and the purposes to which the contributions will be devoted. Moreover, thirty countries withhold, as a matter of announced policy, portions of their assessed budgets and incur no penalties. (See Appendix B, "Estimated Cumulative Withholding by UN Member States as a Matter of Announced Policy")

I do not suggest the U.S. should take lightly the obligation to pay its assessed share of the budget. This is a serious but not an absolute obligation. To be sure, Article 17 of the UN Charter requires member states to pay their share of the U.N. budget as assessed by the General Assembly. We should not assume, however, that any expense apportioned by the General Assembly is automatically valid. To create collective obligations to pay, the expense must be legitimate.

As you know, Congress has for a number of years required that the US withhold the pro rata share of its assessed and voluntary contributions which go either to the two UN committees on Palestinian rights or which go to support UN activities on behalf of the PLO, Cuba or SWAPO. In each of these instances we have deemed the activities of these entities to be in contravention of the basic principles and purposes of the UN Charter and, accordingly, have withheld payment. For related reasons, President Reagan announced last year that the US would withhold from its assessed UN contribution our share of the expenses associated with implementation of the Law of the Sea Treaty, which we determined to not properly be subject to assessment.

As I have already said, thirty countries already withhold parts of their UN asessments for activities they deem improper. The largest withholding by far has occurred by the Soviet bloc states which have withheld more than $260 million. Almost all of this withholding has been from UN peacekeeping operations. This withholding has been determined by the International Court of Justice, in the Certain Expenses Case of 1962, to be in clear contravention of the UN Charter since peacekeeping operations are an essential and thus permissible UN activity tied to the UN's primary purpose of maintaining international peace and security. This is in marked contrast to the withholding patterns of other states, including the US, where the legitimacy of the activity not supported is open to serious question and where no adverse ICJ ruling exists.

In this context, U.S. withholding in protest would not constitute a deviation from our traditional support for the principles of collective financial responsibility for legitimate U.N. expenses. Nor does such limited selective withholding damage the fiscal order of the U.N. by encouraging other nations to engage in selective withholding. They already are doing that and began long before the U.S., pursuant to Congressional directives, started to engage in this practice.

Because withholding for legitimate U.N. expenses had by 1965 become a way of life for the Soviet bloc, the U.S. at that time announced, with the full knowledge and acquiescence of Congress, what has come to be known as the "Goldberg Reservation". That declaration reserves for the U.S. the right to follow the practices of others in selective withholding. As stated by Ambassador Goldberg in 1965:

"* * * if any member can insist on making an exception to the principle of collective financial responsibility with respect to certain activities of the organization, the United States reserves the same option to make exceptions to the principles of collective financial responsibility if, in our view, strong and compelling reasons exist for doing so. There can be no double standard among the members of the organization." U.S. Participation in the U.N. Report by the President to the Congress, 1965, p. 108.

Justice Goldberg, in response to a recent inquiry from me, wrote it was his considered conclusion that:

"* * * there can be no question that under the 'Goldberg Reservation' the United States reserves the right to withold assessments for U.N. activities which, in our opinion, do not serve our national purpose."

(3) I would encourage the Congress in its desire to exercise greater control over U.S. contributions and expenditures to distinguish between U.N. operations and programs which U.S. taxpayers support and those they do not. We should set priorities and make choices in ways that favor programs which are consistent with our values, and that favor agencies which pursue the purposes for which they were established. We should penalize those which, because of politicization and/or inefficiency, have strayed from their legitimate purposes and tasks.

We might, for example, reasonably decide to register firmly through fiscal means, our profound disapproval of UNESCO, which has succumbed to politicization, which creates obstacles to a free press instead of promoting free exchange of information, discriminates against Israel, and which is utterly indifferent to fiscal restraint. It seems to me to be undesirable to impose identical cuts on the Secretariat as a whole when the Secretary General has undertaken a major effort to bring expenses under control and to enhance efficiency, or on the World Health Organization which practices sound management and whose ongoing contributions to eradicating disease are well known. In thinking about cuts we should also distinguish between discretionary items in the assessed budget, such as the number of employees and their salary levels, and non-discretionary items such as peacekeeping activities. While we might want to reduce, perhaps even drastically reduce or eliminate entirely our contributions to one agency, we might well want to expand the other.

Congress' oversight responsibilities vis-a-vis U.S. funding of the United Nations requires constant vigilance of all U.N. activities, whether funded through our assessed or voluntary contributions, to determine their compatibility with the fundamental objectives and principles of the U.N. Charter. However, since our voluntary contributions exceed our assessed contributions and as there are no binding restraints regarding such contributions, I recommend that if Congress is concerned principally about economy, it makes sense to start there, and afterward to move agency by agency through the assessed contributions. In this regard I would like to respectfully suggest to this committee, as I have done in the past in testimony before other Congressional committees, that the U.S. consider adopting the practice of many other large voluntary contributors of earmarking our funds to specific agencies and for specific projects. Thus we would reward the specialized agencies

which do work of which we approve and discontinue or reduce our funding of agencies which engage in practices we do not endorse.

In conclusion, I want to stress how deeply I believe in the important of closer Congressional oversight. By working cooperatively together, I think we both can better fulfill our own responsibilities.

Thank you.

APPENDIX A

Some Measures Taken Since January 1, 1982 To Enhance the Efficiency of the United Nations

(1) The Secretary-General took office when the budget for the two-year period 1982–1983 had already been voted. Thus, the first biennium budget under his control has been the proposed budget for 1984–1985, proposing a net of approximately 1.3 billion dollars as compared to approximately 1.2 billion for the biennium 1982–1983. Almost all the increase is due to inflation; "real growth" is estimated at only 0.7 per cent. (The New York Times of Sunday, 25 September said that the growth of the budget in the United Nations has been brought under control.)

(2) The Secretary-General has established a new internal review procedure to assist him in discharging his responsibilities in respect of planning, programming and budgeting. All submissions from United Nations departments are now vetted by a Programme Planning and Budgeting Board composed of senior officials and chaired by the Secretary-General, or, in his absence, by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, Mr. J. L. Ripert. By introducing this procedure, the Secretary-General has ensured that a more thorough examination is given to all proposals and especially that the relationship of each proposal to the totality of the budget is better measured. The Board also oversees the monitoring and evaluation functions in the Secretariat, with a view of ensuring overall consistency and coherence of approaches both within the Secretariat and in relation to concerned intergovernmental bodies.

(3) As regards proposals for new programmes or activities, the Secretary-General has undetaken to examine comprehensively the extent to which these can be met through the redeployment of resources released through the curtailment, delayed implementation or termination of lowest priority activities.

(4) In August 1983, the Secretary-General initiated a searching examination of the administration of the United Nations, covering such aspects as the structure of the Secretariat, management systems and techniques, delegation of authority and simplification of procedures. In this regard, the Secretary-General, in his annual report on the Work of the Organization, stressed the need to maintain the financial integrity of the Organization and to safeguard the concept of a unified Secretariat. He noted, that, after nearly four decades of wear and tear, the Secretariat needs "a careful overhaul so as to ensure that it meets with increased efficiency the needs of this larger, more complex and more decentralized Organization". It is intended that this inquiry continue during the first part of 1984.

(5) Programmes are also underway to streamline, modernize and reduce costs in critical cost centres such a travel, telecommunications, documentation preparation and production etc. These programmes emphasize improved planning and greater use of computer-based systems.

(6) Greater efficiency and effectiveness have been achieved through more decentralization of administrative and financial authority to major offices away from Headquarters subject to clearly stipulated policy guidelines, reporting procedures and monitoring.

(7) It should be noted that the finances and administration of the Organization are subject to constant review by a number of independent expert bodies appointed by, and reporting to, the General Assembly (their reports are available to Member States and to the public-at-large). For example:

The biennium budgets and all related financial aspects are reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) which is in session for approximately six months each year and is composed of 16 intergovernmental experts who serve in their individual capacities;

Programme implementation and evaluation are reviewed *inter alia* by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) which is composed of 11 independent experts serving in their individual capacities;

The accounts of the organization are examined meticulously by a Board of External Auditors, composed of the Chief Auditors of three Member States.

APPENDIX B.—ESTIMATED CUMULATIVE WITHHOLDING BY U.N. MEMBER STATES AS A MATTER OF ANNOUNCED POLICY

[All sums in thousands of U.S. Dollars. Note: Entries under the headings of the Bond Issue, Reg Program of Technical Assistance and Other Budget items are estimated to Dec. 31, 1981 (A/C.5/36/28); UNDOF/UNEF (73) and UNIFIL are shown as of the end of 1981 (A/C.5/36/28)), UNEF (56) and Congo (ONUC) are shown as at Dec. 31, 1979 (A/35/5, vol. 1), these figures not updated until 37th G.A., late in 1982]

	Bond issue	Reg prog. tech. assist.[1]	Other budget items[2]	UNDOF/UNEF (73)[3]	UNIFIL[4]	UNEF (56)	Congo (ONUC)	Total
Albania	45.3		[5] 0	19.6	9.7	45.3	43.6	163.5
Algeria					108.6			108.6
Benin				9.6	4.6			14.2
Bulgaria	259.3	229.0	49.0	27.5	147.9	181.2	190.7	1,084.6
Byelorrussian SSR	747.1	758.0	152.0	558.1	1,954.3	911.9	1,857.9	6,439.3
China	3,849.4		[8] 114.2	35,935.8	19,455.1			[7] 59,354.5
Cuba	28.0		9.8		107.6	249.8	260.3	655.5
Czechoslovakia	1,471.1		216.9	397.7	4,087.0	1,814.8	2,759.4	10,746.9
Democratic Kampuches			[8] 70.6	19.6				90.2
Democratic Yemen				4.3	4.6			8.9
France	[9] 4,367.6						17,031.2	21,398.6
German Democratic Republic	926.5	1,176.4	147.8	1,223.7	6,674.6			10,149.0
Hungary	691.0		249.1		323.1	898.3	995.0	3,156.5
India			[10] 47.5					47.5
Iraq				84.4	99.9			184.3
Jordan						45.3	43.6	88.9
Lao People's Democratic Republic					4.6			4.6
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya				173.9	194.2			368.1
Mongolia	46.1		7.2	8.1	9.7	12.4	17.2	100.7
Poland	2,166.0		284.0		6,405.0	2,528.4	2,446.0	13,849.4
Portugal	49.7							49.7
Romania	491.5		376.2			682.2	641.0	2,190.9
Saudi Arabia						74.9		74.9
South Africa	778.3		[11] 13,401.0	2,587.5	2,056.9			18,823.7
Syrian Arab Republic				25.2	24.9			50.1
U.S.A.			[12] 402.7					383.5
Ukrainian SSR	2,808.0	1005.7	571.5	2,084.4	7,305.6	3,476.6	5,108.7	23,237.2
U.S.S.R.	21,277.6	14,437.8	4,331.1	18,447.2	65,852.4	27,665.6	39,223.1	191,234.0
Vietnam				8.8	29.3			38.1
Yemen				9.2				9.2
Totals	40,002.5	18,406.9	20,411.4	61,624.6	114,059.3	38,586.7	70,214.7	364,106.1

Foot notes on following page.

[1] Includes only those countries which specifically state that they are withholding for this item. Other member states may also withhold for Technical Assistance, but do not specify a definite amount.

[2] Unless otherwise indicated, "Other Budget Items" are primarily the United Nations Commissioner for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK), the U.N. Memorial Cemetery in Korea and, prior to 1968, the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO) and the U.N. Field Service.

[3] Estimated cumulative withholding from inception of UNEF (1973) through the completion of its liquidation and from the inception of UNDOF in 1974 to Nov. 30, 1981.

[4] Estimated cumulative withholding from inception of UNIFIL on Mar. 19, 1978 to Dec. 18, 1981.

[5] The U.N.'s accounting office insists that their records indicate the payment by Albania of its previous arrearage of $37,000 for other budget items.

[6] This figure has remained stable since 1975 and includes prior years' withholding for China's share of the expenses for the U.N. cemetery in Korea; the cost of "certain offices" of UNHCR concerned with Tibetan/Chinese refugees; expenses related to a study of the reduction of military budgets of security council permanent member states; the U.N. Commission for the Reunification and Rehabilitation of Korea; The U.N. Military Observer Mission in India and Pakistan; the U.N. Truce Supervisory Organization (UNTSO, which operates in the Middle East); the U.N. Middle East Mission; and an unspecified amount for the Required Progress of Technical Assistance.

[7] On Dec. 19, 1981, by a recorded vote of 115(US)–13–0, the U.N. adopted Res 36/116 A, by which all of China's arrearages for peacekeeping ($52 million, or 92 percent of its total arrearage) were placed into a "special account" to which the Chinese may make a voluntary contribution, but the total of which will not be used to compute the total arrearages which would cause China to lose its vote in the General Assembly, under the provision of Article 19 of the Charter.

[8] Arrears of contributions for period preceding Apr. 17, 1975, which obligations Democratic Kampuchea states it does not recognize.

[9] Withholding relates to 1963–71 only.

[10] India's assessed share of expenses relating to the observer corps on the borders between India and Pakistan for 1965 and 1966.

[11] Includes arrrears of contributions through 1981, which South Africa states will only be paid upon assurance that its rights are fully restored.

[12] Withheld as the U.S. assessed share of the cost of the committee and Secretariat office concerned with Palestinian affairs.

NOTES

Total withholding by the Soviet Union (U.S.S.R. Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR) $220,911,300.

Total withholding by the Soviet bloc; $259,998.4 (includes Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czecholovakia, GDR, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian SSR, and U.S.S.R.). Romania, Cuba, and Vietnam often join the bloc on votes; their combined withholdings total $2,884.5.

The Republic of the Congo, a long time withholder for assessments under UNDOF/UNEF (73), and UNIFIL, was removed from the list this year by the U.N. because the Congo has announced its intent to challenge the size of its assessment.

Peacekeeping operations—definitions: UNDOF—U.N. Disengagement Observer Force, established in 1974 to supervise the cessation of hostilities between Israel and Syria on the Goldan Heights. *UNEF (56)*—U.N. Emergency Force established to supervise the cessation of hostilities for the Arab-Israeli War of 1956. UNEF (73)—Established to supervise the cessation of hostilities between Israel and Egypt in the Sinai Peninsula. UNIFIL—U.N. forces in Lebanon, established in 1978. Congo (ONUC)—U.N. Operations in the Congo (Zaire) from 1960 to 1965.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you.

The Acting Secretary of State has sent me a letter opposing the Kassebaum amendment. Let me read you one paragraph from the letter and then I would like to ask you if you agree. It is dated October 1, 1983, and I quote: [1]

> The administration opposes this amendment because it would place the United States in breach of its international obligations in a manner that would jeopardize United States voting rights in the affected international organization. We support authorization of the amendments originally requested.
>
> Sincerely, Kenneth W. Dam, Acting Secretary.

Do you agree with the Acting Secretary's statement?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I would like to say that I have in my testimony, you may have noticed, neither supported nor opposed the Kassebaum amendment. I generally regard it here as my function before the Congress to try to provide information and analysis rather than, quite frankly, to argue my personal opinions.

Since you have asked my personal opinion, however, I will tell you that if I were a Member of the Congress, I would not vote for the Kassebaum amendment. I say that with all respect and friendship for the Senator from Kansas and for all of those of her colleagues in the Senate, many of whom are good friends of mine who supported that amendment and who voted for it.

I do not, myself, believe that an across-the-board nonprogrammatic deep cut in the U.S. contribution to the United Nations is desirable, and quite frankly I would have a very rough time defending it. I believe that the problem which is addressed in that amendment is a very serious one, and I do not think that it is dealt with by broad sweeping affirmations of the value of the United Nations.

I submit that my commitment to the United Nations and my conviction of its potential and full value in international affairs is very strong, but that does not, and in my opinion cannot, justify a good many of the fiscal and organizational practices there.

The fact is the organization is fiscally out of control. Everyone knows that. It is not an open secret, it is no kind of secret at all, and somehow the Congress needs to come to grips with that problem. I don't believe personally that the most effective way to go about that is through broad, deep nonprogrammatic cuts. I think that would be very hard on the organization and, frankly, would create really terrible problems for the organization.

Mr. LANTOS. Would you yield?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I may say with one other aspect of the question you raised, I can't say that the Acting Secretary is mistaken when he says that if we were to withhold selectively it would put our voting rights in jeopardy. I can simply say that that has never happened in the history of the United Nations to any country which has withheld selectively. So one would have to say that it is extremely unlikely that that would be the case.

Mr. SOLOMON. Would you be good enough to read the last paragraph of the letter?

Mr. YATRON. Yes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Just for the record.

---

[1] See appendix 2 for full text of letter.

Mr. YATRON. "While we share many of the concerns that precipitated this action and agreed that the United Nations has its deficiencies, we feel the U.S. interests are best served by constructive participation in the United Nations family of organizations."

Mr. YATRON. I yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank the Chair for yielding.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, I was trying to follow your carefully crafted response, and I would like to ask you to tell me whether I read you correctly.

It seems to me that you are testifying that if you were a Member of Congress, you would oppose in its present form the Kassebaum cut because it is nonprogrammatic, nonpinpointed, across the board, from which I infer that you would not be opposed to pinpointed, targeted programmatic cuts in the funding of agencies and activities that you would deem hostile to United States interests.

For instance, in your testimony, you talk about UNESCO, instead of promoting the free flow of information and press freedom has, and I would fully agree with you, moved in the opposite direction condoning the suppression of a free press.

I take it you would not be opposed to cuts in UNESCO funding as long as UNESCO engages in antifree press activities. Am I reading you accurately?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. You are reading me correctly.

Mr. LANTOS. If I may pursue for 1 more minute, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. YATRON. Without objection.

Mr. LANTOS. You are stating, Ambassador Kirkpatrick, that the United Nations is fiscally out of control, which is a strong statement, a statement that again I would agree with.

Do you feel that it is appropriate for the Congress of the United States to try to bring the United Nations under a degree of fiscal discipline?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Providing that the Congress of the United States in its wisdom can find a way to do that, which does not throw out the baby with the proverbial bathwater, or cause more destructive consequences to the organization than would be reasonable or desirable.

I may say that I think that the problem of the fiscal restraint in the United Nations has come on rather suddenly in the last decade.

Interestingly enough, it developed alongside, partly, not only the growing number, the growing size of the United Nations, members of the General Assembly, but also of their growing realization of their own power. So we have a kind of automatic majority today which can, and unfortunately very frequently does govern, physically speaking, by logrolling.

I sometimes say that the General Assembly reminds me a lot of descriptions of State legislatures at the turn of the century, with a very great deal of logrolling.

Mr. LANTOS. It is that bad?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That is pretty bad. Actually it is pretty bad. It really fits rather closely the descriptions of a lot of the State legislatures of the turn of the century.

Now, I think that the Secretary General is really quite deeply committed to trying to do his best to get a grip on this process, but he is, of course, also the employee of his members, so to speak, so I think above all, it is the task of the member nations, specifically those who have the largest responsibility for funding the organization, to try working together to find some way of bringing this budget and these fiscal practices back under control.

I don't have any doubt that the Congress is an important player in this process potentially. I don't think it is something that we in the United States can or even really should attempt to do simply by ourselves, although I do believe very deeply that we are morally, as well as politically, obliged to scrutinize some of the expenditures and programs of the United Nations which we are significant funders of in order to make certain that we are not funding important violations of our most basic constitutional principles, such as free speech and free press and the principle of universality.

Mr. LANTOS. I yield.

Mr. YATRON. Ambassador Kirkpatrick, since an expression of congressional concern about the size of the United Nations budget would be helpful to our efforts, what are the principal points that you would like to see expressed by Congress?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Generally speaking, let me say I would like to see the Congress continue its funding of United Nations agencies at recommended levels. I would like to be clear about that.

I have supported the generous funding in fact of a good many of the independent agencies. I would like to see the Congress discriminate, quite frankly, between the constructive organizations, which are well managed and which are devoting themselves and their activities to the purposes for which the organization was established, and those whom because they have fallen prey to an unruly majority, maybe who for some reason or another does not support the purposes for which they are established, I would like to see the Congress discriminate.

That is, I suppose that is my principal positive message personally. I personally would not like to see the Congress pass the Kassebaum amendment. I would be really quite sorry to see the Congress pass the Kassebaum amendment.

I think Mr. Leach misunderstood, in his eagerness to get an advance copy of my testimony, my position with regard to the Kassebaum amendment.

Mr. YATRON. Would that be an example of the well-managed agencies?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Pardon me?

Mr. YATRON. Would that be an example of the well-managed agencies you are referring to or——

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I think there are a good many of them. I mentioned the World Health Organization, for example, which we have assessed contributions. It is very well managed. I think the UNHCR, U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Development Program, of which former Congressman Brad Morse is head; UNICEF, ITU [International Telecommunications Union].

There are a good many of the scientific and humanitarian independent agencies which I think are well managed, which I think are very constructively pursuing goals which Americans very much want to support. I think that there are some that don't.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you.

Mr. Leach.

Mr. LEACH. Let me just ask, Madam Ambassador, since you favor opposition to this Kassebaum amendment, whether in total funding levels, you favor the United States——

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I favor which position?

Mr. LEACH. You favor opposition to the Kassebaum amendment.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I personally oppose it.

Mr. LEACH. Do you favor the United States cutting back on its contribution to the United Nations, holding at the prescribed 25 percent level, or going above?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I might want to discriminate.

Mr. LEACH. I recognize you want to discriminate individually by institution. But in total levels, are you for the United States at this time cutting back its contribution to the United Nations or do you favor——

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I don't think I could answer that question at the global level because I don't know how it would come out.

Mr. LEACH. Let me stress that the President you represent stated very, very powerfully that he did not favor cutting back on U.S. contributions to the United Nations. In your statement today, you have come before this subcommittee and outlined a series of rationales for cutting back, and criteria you would apply for such cutbacks.

Thus, I think it is only fair for this Congress to ask, what is the position of the administration which you represent? Does the U.S. Government favor a cutback of funding for the United Nations or holding at the current obligatory level which we are committed by treaty to maintain even though, as you point out, there may or may not be a firm obligation implied?

My question is: Do you as a representative of the administration, favor the current funding levels for the United Nations, or do you favor cutbacks or increases?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Congressman Leach, I think that I did not in my statement—I think you misread my statement, if I may say so. I did not in my statement indicate that I favored cutbacks. I did in my statement say that I believe the U.N. budget process is out of control.

Mr. LEACH. That is true.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. And I believe that this year or next year, or the next year, the Congress will come to grips. I believe the Congress is confronted with a problem and the problem is a budget process out of control, and the problem is, how can the Congress get some sort of handle on this process?

I have reflected a good deal on that, and I have, in responding to a request to appear to discuss the Kassebaum amendment and U.S. funding, tried to identify certain principles which I think might be useful to the Congress in reaching its decisions on that question of cutback.

I frankly do not know whether, if I could simply take a pen myself, make the decisions that I would like to make personally with regard to funding of the various agencies, it would come out equal to or more than or less than the total——

Mr. LEACH. Let me——

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That is to me not a meaningful question.

Mr. LEACH. It is a meaningful question to the Congress of the United States and one that can be asked of the administration. You are not an academic. You are a representative of the Government of the United States of America.

My point is: You are trying to have your cake and eat it too. You want to imply criticism of the United Nations. You want to imply a more conservative bias than has even been reflected by the President you represent. Yet we have certain legal obligations of international stature to that institution. I have asked you a direct question, not whether or not we should be contributing more or less to certain institutions within the United Nations as compared to others, but whether it is the recommendation of this administration to stand firm in our commitment.

The President you represent has stated that unequivocally, and I will read his quote again, if you would like. Again my question to you is: What is your position as a representative of this administration? You have not responded.

I must say, in your statement, you carefully referenced the Kassebaum amendment, and presented criteria for cutting U.S. funding to the United Nations. I am thankful that in response to the chairman's question you indicated that you are opposed to it, something which in your original statement you were reluctant to do. So we made that step forward. I am asking for a second step.

Does this administration favor a cutback of funding to the United Nations or does it not?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Leach, I do not believe that I am in a position to respond to that question. You have the administration recommendations. They are perfectly clear. The statement I think that you have accorded to the President was made a year ago last June at the time that he appeared before the second special session on disarmament. He has repeatedly stated his broad support for the U.S. role in the United Nations, and for the United Nations, so have we all.

Certainly we feel that. I think that the administration recommendations with regard to financing are perfectly clear. I was told that the Congress was certainly going to cut the U.N. budget and that I would be asked to address those questions. I have tried to do so in my statement and if you don't find it helpful, I am sorry.

Mr. LEACH. I am sorry, too. For clarity, a question has been asked as to whether this administration favors a cutback of funding to the United Nations or not. So far you have danced on the head of a needle.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I said that the administration's position was made clear when it transmitted its budget.

Mr. LEACH. Could you tell us, in one sentence, what is the recommendation? Do you favor full funding of the United Nations under our treaty commitment or do you not? Would you answer that?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Obviously, you have asked me the administration's position. The administration's position is to favor full funding of the budget it recommended to the Congress, of course.

Mr. LEACH. And is that a reflection of full funding under our commitment to pay approximately 25 percent? Do you favor a cutback in that or not?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Actually it also includes some withholding provisions, too.

Mr. LEACH. Do you favor full funding of the 25 percent?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. No; I do not.

Mr. LEACH. What level do you favor?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Well, I favor, for example, the withholding amendments which the Congress has provided for the last 3 or 4 years, the withholding of funds for programs whose primary function is to benefit the PLO, SWAPO, or Cuba. I favor withholding as provided by the President on the U.S. share of preparatory conference expenses for the Law of the Sea.

Mr. LEACH. Let me shift gears.

Do you favor locating the United Nations half the time in Moscow?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. No. That was, as I made very clear at the time, Mr. Leach, a semifacetious comment which was not a proposal. It was asserted, my view, which is a seriously held one, that it would be useful for the delegates to the United Nations to have substantial experience with what is called the way of life of the other great superpower.

Mr. LEACH. I share that entirely. We all share the perspective that a little immersion in Soviet East bloc society might be helpful in providing a perspective for U.N. delegates. But when a comment suggesting the United Nations be located on a half-time basis in Moscow is made on national television by the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, which is later picked up by the President of the United States, it ends up having a very unchivalrous effect on the foreign delegates we host, and has, in addition, sparked an internal domestic debate on whether the United Nations should be located in the United States.

I have read very carefully the statement the President made to the United Nations last week. It was a fine statement. Without any hesitation, the President of the United States came to New York and proclaimed he is proud the United Nations is located in the United States. He said he is very proud of the United Nations and its basic ideals.

Because, however, of delegation comments, we have sparked something in our society that is dramatically unfortunate. The public has been caused to question the whole rationale for the United Nations and whether we want to be part of it. I think it is time that people very forthcomingly make a firm statement that they respect and honor the United Nations, and are proud to have it here.

My concern about your statement, Madam Ambassador, was that there was hardly anything in it with which one can disagree, but the flavor that was left was one of refusing to stand up for interna-

tional institutions. Is this really a time to be so enormously critical? I just wonder.

If we are to take the three greatest issues before America today, one would have to say arms control is No. 1; maybe 2 is regional conflicts and how they are——

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Number——

Mr. LEACH. Regional conflicts and how they are managed. But No. 3 would have to be whether we are going to expand the rule of law and strengthen international institutions. By position your basic responsibility isn't the first two, but it is, to more than a small extent, the third. I frankly don't sense an enormous commitment to expanding international law and strengthening international institutions when I see this type of criticism and this type of cheap carping.

The irony of the United States and not the Soviet Union doing all the criticism today is enormous. That doesn't mean that there aren't any of us in politics who don't see severe problems with that institution. But, by gosh, now is the time, in the judgment of a lot of Americans, to make it unequivocally clear that rather than carping about the United Nations, we ought to be trying to manage what is happening there in a more constructive fashion.

Mr. YATRON. It is not just the Congress that faces the budget, we look to the President for leadership. Do you think a Presidential Commission might be useful to review U.S. participation in international organizations, and particularly with respect to the issue of U.S. financial support?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I think—I don't know, Congressman Yatron. I am sorry, I don't mean to be avoiding the issue. I think it would be very useful for the Congress to focus on that issue broadly and what I guess I hope the Congress will do is focus not just on the question of the U.N. budget this year but on this broader question of the problems of financing and the U.S. role in it.

I would like to say that there is no more ardent supporter of the importance of the constructive activities of the United Nations and those who fulfill the Charter than I am, and I think it is one of the reasons that I worry about the extent to which the budget is, for example, now out of control, is that I think it is uncompatible with a healthy organization.

I think that it would be very useful for the Congress to undertake a systemic discussion of this going beyond this year's budget, and it might be useful for it to discuss this with the executive branch.

Mr. YATRON. Would you object to providing the subcommittee with an expanded statement for the record?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I would be happy to do that if you would like.

[The information follows:]

With respect to the United Nations, I think it is clear that as the organization functions today, or at least as the political bodies—the General Assembly and Security Council—function, it does not much resemble what we in the US thought the organization would be at its founding. So while I believe the process by which budgets are compiled, voted and assessed is worth studying, I would hope that any joint Executive-Legislative panel would look beyond the budget to broader United Nations issues, including such things as bloc voting, universality of membership, and the like. I think above all, if such a group is to be created, it should particularly

examine the question of why the United States is so often isolated in the UN, and what can be done about it.

Moreover, I believe that such a study should extend to a rigorous "cost-benefit" analysis of our participation in the entire UN system—including the specialized agencies such as WHO, FAO, UNESCO, and the rest, and should also look at such affiliated bodies as the Human Rights Commission. It seems to me that many Americans are rather unclear about what the UN is and is not, what it can and cannot do, as well as what it ought and ought not do. A thorough, serious study is bound to be useful and I certainly would support it.

The essential point, in my judgment, is that such a study re-open the fundamental question of the UN as the principal international forum for multilateral diplomacy, how this relates to bilateral and regional U.S. diplomacy, whether indeed if we had it to do all over again we would or should join the United Nations, and under what terms and conditions.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you.

Mr. Solomon.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the chairman for the time and just have an offhanded comment.

I heard Mr. Leach in his opening remarks tear our Ambassador and our President apart, and then in his last few statements there he was praising the President for his statements before the United Nations. I think it is a question of who is dancing on the head of the needle here.

But let me ask you, in other words, what you are saying about the budget? Is it that we pay approximately a quarter of the shot on the assessed portion and also a quarter of the increases too, and yet our hands are completely tied? We really can't do anything about that under the rules of the United Nations; is that right?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Yes, our hands are like any other nation's.

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me just ask you, I was somewhat concerned, as we have been debating pay raises for Members of Congress and pay raises for civil servants, I was looking at some of the figures concerning the salaries of U.N. personnel. I understand that on the average, the salaries of U.N. personnel are about 35 percent above our own U.S. top civil servants.

Is there some rule that guides the salaries in the United Nations? How can that be?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Well, of course, first of all, that is correct; it is also the case that we are only one of 158 members of the United Nations, and we can hardly reasonably expect that the organizations simply follow our practices. I may say that the Soviet representative has commented to me that U.N. salaries are even still more higher as compared to Soviet salaries than they are as compared to American Government salaries, because our government salaries are somewhat higher than theirs.

I think we could not expect that the United Nations would simply follow our own programs. Initially there was a theory the United Nations should try to attract the best people in the world to compete with the national bureaucrats. It should pay something above what the national bureaucracies paid. I think that most employees of the national bureaucracy today feel that the United Nations pays too much more than their own national bureaucracy. Certainly all of the nations who are the major contributors feel that way.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, I for one, would appreciate it if you could furnish for the record some accurate and documented statistics showing these salary levels.[1] I think that is important for Members of Congress to know, because there is no question but that the Kassebaum amendment is going to come before the House, and there are many of us who sympathize with that amendment.

However, we might want to take an approach, about which you have mentioned several alternatives in categorizing what cuts we might make. Certainly it is going to be a question before this House and it is going to receive very strong consideration, not only from myself but probably the majority of the Congress.

Let me just ask you, you were talking about a number of agencies, and I don't want to put you on the spot, but we know the problems that we have had with UNESCO and with what they are trying to do with the press.

In your own personal opinion, not speaking for the administration, could you tell me whether or not we should withdraw from UNESCO and could you just explain your position on that?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Congressman Solomon, my personal opinion is that UNESCO is today pursuing a great many policies and programs which are in very powerful contradiction to the purposes and values for which it was established and which are also not consistent with American values.

Let me give you a single example. UNESCO was the first organization which legislated, as it were, policies that discriminated seriously against Israel and decreed that Israel should not benefit, in fact, from UNESCO programs. This is discriminatory, it violates the principle of universality.

UNESCO has for a number of years had a range of activities which are really very damaging to a free press, I think. And one of its principal purposes is to promote the free exchange of ideas and information, in other words, strengthen and promote a free press in the world, but a great many of its activities have in fact had the opposite effects.

Now, I don't know whether you noticed in this morning's New York Times there is a story of an international news and editorial group meeting in Paris, I think it was today, which has expressed its very deep continuing concern about the extent to which UNESCO is imposing obstacles to a free press, particularly for news gathering in so-called Third World countries.

In addition to that, UNESCO has been really of all the United Nations agencies the least concerned about everybody's concerns about trying to bring the budget under control. Their budget has grown more rapidly than almost any other agency's with less good excuse, I may say, or reason.

I know also that when the ILO for a period—International Labor Organization—was in its functioning essentially betraying the purposes for which it was established, the American labor representatives, representing AFL-CIO, took the initiative in really bringing about United States withdrawal from the ILO. The United States stayed out of the ILO for several years, and I think that had a rather salutary effect, quite frankly.

---

[1] See appendix 5.

So I suppose when I look at that all together, I think it might make sense for the United States to withdraw from the UNESCO for a while, at least, maybe forever. But as long as the functions of UNESCO are as incompatible with the purposes for which it was established and basic constitutional principles of the United States, I think I guess we don't belong to there. It is hard for me to justify in my own thinking the U.S. contributions of $50 million a year to that organization.

Mr. SOLOMON. Just in closing, I thank you, Madame Ambassador. I go back to this statement that was made that our gross national product in comparison to other countries. You know if we look at it across the board, we are forced to spend more on defense than we should.

We spend a great deal more than all the other countries when it comes to humanitarian needs of our people and, therefore, we cannot always be the leader in everything. When we see fiscal mismanagement such as we have in the United Nations, whether we support the concept or not, we certainly have to take actions that will force them to be fiscally responsible, and we intend to do that. It may not necessarily be through the Kassebaum amendment.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. May I just add there, please, that we also have much larger bilateral economic assistance programs than many other nations.

Mr. SOLOMON. I had forgotten to mention that, and I thank you for doing it.

Mr. YATRON. The gentleman from California, Mr. Levine.

Mr. LEVINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, I would like to follow up several elements of your testimony that I am still not entirely clear on. The first one to a certain extent falls onto some of the questions of Congressman Solomon with regard to fiscal management and some of your statements with regard to the U.N. budget being out of control, as I understand them.

It seems to me that whether the budget is out of control is a subjective statement to a certain extent. There is no fixed standard for what is in control and what is out of control.

I think it is clear that during part of that past 10 years, if not most of it, there has been a very significant expansion of the budget. But according to figures which we were supplied by the State Department recently, for the next fiscal year, I understand that the figures are as follows—and I would appreciate it if you correct me if I am wrong—that the United Nations is slated for the next fiscal year to have a seventh-tenths of 1 percent real growth in its budget; the ILO less than 2 percent; FAO, one-half of 1 percent, and WHO actually lower.

I guess my questions are: (a) Are those figures accurate, and (b) if so, isn't that a good response by the United Nations and its agencies to the allegation that the budget is out of control?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Congressman Levine, I would like to respond two ways. I hope I emphasized in my statement that we have been trying hard in conjunction with a good many of our colleagues, including the Eastern bloc countries; two, that the Secretary General was trying hard; three, that none of this combination had yet succeeded.

The sense in which I referred to the U.N. budget being out of control was I would like to suggest technical and literal. I meant to suggest that it is out of control in the specific sense that nobody controls it except the shifting majority in the General Assembly. The reason I mentioned the budget process, the fact that there is a budget drawn up by the Secretariat, on the basis of the recommendations from the various agencies with input, it is reviewed by member states and ACABQ [Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions] and it goes through a multireview process and is finally adopted in the end by a vote of the plenary and the General Assembly.

Between the time the budget is adopted or the budget is drawn up and recommended by the Secretariat and the time it is finally adopted, a lot of things happen to it. One of the things that happens to it is that resolutions are adopted—as the General Assembly develops; we are just now beginning this General Assembly.

As the General Assembly goes on, resolutions will be proposed for a lot of activities which are not foreseen by the budget, by the committees drawing up the budget. Those resolutions may have fiscal implications, we call it in U.N. language.

There is a rule now that was inaugurated by the Secretary General that every resolution must have its fiscal implications made manifest before it is adopted, how much it is going to cost, in other words. Usually it costs quite a bit and very frequently nobody cares much, and so this is what I meant by the add-on process.

There is a process, a rational budgeting, in which the Secretariat and most of the members who are major contributors may have made a very large effort to bring under control, but because there is add-on budgeting, as it were, on a kind of ad hoc basis, as the GA (General Assembly) continues, it keeps spiraling upward and upward. Nobody has any notion at any stage in the GA what the final total is likely to be or how what is being adopted on a Thursday relates to what will be done the next Wednesday. It is just added on.

Those figures which you have reflect the efforts of the Secretariat before this add-on process begins.

Mr. LEVINE. This is before the add-on process, so then as I understand your testimony, whatever dollar amount is arrived at, at a particular time, is simply a floor.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. LEVINE. And depending upon what happens during this add-on process, there could be an infinite expansion of the budget.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That is right.

Mr. LEVINE. Is there any budgeting within the add-on process?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. No; then there is never any subtraction. This is literally what I mean. In political science, we regularly describe budget processes like this as being uncontrolled budgeting basically. There is no comprehensive look because nobody knows what resolutions the various committees are going to recommend finally when they report. Resolutions are first adopted in the committees, they may be amended on the floor of the plenary, and nobody has a picture of the whole.

32-616 O - 84 - 4

The request that every resolution have financial implications appended to it was an effort in this direction, and it was a good step in this direction.

Mr. LEVINE. When did that begin?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Some years ago. The position that we in the United States took last year was that we would, unless there is an overriding national interest to the contrary, we would vote against any resolution which raised costs unless the resolution also provided that those costs should be funded at existing program levels.

Mr. LEVINE. Do you know the extent to which in the add-on process over the course of the past 2 or 3 years the budget has been increased?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. We did in fact a specific analysis of that last year at U.S. mission to the United Nations, and I am not sure I remember the exact figures. I can supply that to you. We did that analysis. I would rather not trust my memory.

Mr. LEVINE. I think it would be helpful to the committee if I might request two things from you for the record.

One would be the extent to which the budget has been increased through the add-on process for whatever years you have that information available; and, second, whether you could provide for the record a chart detailing U.N. growth over each of the last 10 years and also personnel growth over each of the last 10 years.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. We can try.

Mr. LEVINE. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

Add-ons to the United Nations Budget

	Millions
I. Biennuim 1978–79:	
Secretary General's initial estimate	$775.2
Recommended deletions by ACABQ	−26.0
	749.2
General Assembly changes during biennium: nondiscretionary 104.7 (13.97 percent); discretionary 39.4 (5.26 percent)	144.1
Final net appropriation	893.3
II. Biennium 1980–81:	
Secretary General	993.1
Recommended deletions by ACABQ	−24.2
	968.9
General Assembly changes during biennium: nondiscretionary 68.5 (7.07 percent); discretionary 57.5 (5.93 percent)	126.0
Final net appropriations	1,094.9
III. Biennium 1982–83:	
Secretary General's initial estimate	1,251.4
Recommended deletions by ACABQ	−43.7
	1,207.7
General Assembly changes during biennum: nondiscretionary −75.3 (−6.23 percent); discretionary 83.5 (6.91 percent)	8.2
Current net appropriation [1]	1,215.9

[1] Additional changes may be made in course of current General Assembly.

U.N. GROWTH AND PERSONNEL GROWTH, 1974–83

Year	Number of members	Number of established posts
1974	138	9,372
1975	144	9,586
1976	147	10,243
1977	149	10,352
1978	151	10,725
1979	152	10,695
1980	154	11,214
1981	157	11,371
1982	157	11,580
1983	158	11,722

Mr. LEVINE. In response to the letter that the chairman read to you from the Acting Secretary, among other things, you said that you didn't think, or at least I thought you said you didn't think our voting rights were likely to be jeopardized. Was I correct?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEVINE. What do you think would be the likely reaction in the United Nations if the Kassebaum amendments were passed?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Well, I think if it were to pass in its current form, quite frankly, it would be very negative. That is, I don't like to criticize proposals of Members of the Congress, least of all Members of the Congress whom I respect and like, quite frankly, but I think there is one aspect of that amendment which would

be particularly negative, and it is the part B that requires that any payment we paid would be accepted as payment in full.

That really, I think, would be regarded there as a serious effort at infringing the self-governing qualities, capacities, of the United Nations. I think it would be regarded as fiscal blackmail of an unacceptable sort. I also believe it would be regarded as punitive in that it would be regarded as punitive to the institutions, not punitive, not an expression of U.S. disagreement or disapproval of this or that activity, but as punitive to the institution, itself, because of its across-the-board nonprogrammatic character.

Mr. LEVINE. You were getting into my followup question, which is the difference in the reaction between your proposal and the Kassebaum proposal. I take it you believe that there would be a significant difference in the reaction at the United Nations between the proposal that is across the board dealing with the institution, and a proposal such as the one that you have outlined, which would be programmatic?

And if you do, I assume you do feel that way, why would the reaction differ?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I think, first of all, if the United States were to, if the U.S. Congress were to cut the United States contributions to the independent agencies, the so-called voluntary contributions, this would be regretted by our colleagues in the United Nations, but it would be regarded first as wholly within the right of the U.S. Government and raising no question of obligation or legality whatever.

Now, if we were to cut, simply reject, unilaterally our 25-percent obligation as such, that is to reject the right of the United Nations to set levels of assessment for its members, basically that is what that would constitute, and I think that is a very profound challenge again to the organizations, self-governing organizations would be regarded as such and deeply resented as such by everyone virtually.

There are, by the way, a number of fiscal and administrative matters on which there is something called a permanent member's convention—permanent member's convention—which includes Soviets and Chinese and British and French, and we cooperate really quite closely with the Soviets on a range of administrative and fiscal matters.

So, I mentioned that to express the fact that there is broad concensus in the United Nations on a number of these basic fiscal and administrative questions, including the right of the United Nations to set assessments. I think it would be widely felt that if we were going to contest the assessments, we should do so—first at least try it within the organization, which we have not done in recent years, and before the Congress acted simply to arbitrarily limit our contributions across the board.

I think that if we were to cut our contribution elsewhere on grounds of principal disagreement with activities that that would be regretted, it would be criticized, but it would be understood and not as an attack on the organization, as such.

Mr. LEVINE. I think that the outrageous conduct which you have outlined that is pursued by UNESCO and which is understood by the broad bipartisan cross-section of Congress to be every bit as

outrageous as you have outlined, it is something a number of us would like to feel we could have an impact in terms of responding to.

Is there anything you think the Congress could do that would be constructive in this area, and are there areas separate and apart from the fiscal areas that might be a constructive means of pursuit with regard to fiscal areas, with response to activities such as the ones that you have outlined?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Congressman, I would like to say, if I recall, I do not have any formal responsibility for U.S. participation in UNESCO, and there is a committee inside the State Department, I am not even certain that it is an interagency committee—certainly it is an intradepartment committee I think—which has been examining the question of U.S. participation in UNESCO.

I can say to you, though, since it is a U.N. agency, it is discussed a good deal in New York, as well, and a good many of our closest allies are as revolted virtually by the UNESCO behavior as we are, and we have been working quite closely with them.

I think if Congress is seriously interested in this matter, first they would be well-advised to elicit testimony from Assistant Secretary Newell and whoever is chairing that committee and perhaps from our Ambassador, Jean Girard, on it. I would like very much, quite frankly, to see Congress take a more active interest in UNESCO and the U.S. contribution to UNESCO. I think there is a serious question about the morality frankly of a major contribution which we make to the activities that that organization actually conducts.

Mr. LEVINE. I have just one other question, and that is this. In making judgments that we must make with regard to U.N. funding, I think an understanding of those judgments has to do with our general view of the value that the United Nations continues to have as an instrument of foreign policy for this Government and for other governments, but obviously primarily for this Government.

In the recent past, we have heard so much criticism and so much condemnation, I was wondering, as our Ambassador to the United Nations, if you might be able to spend a moment or two outlining to this subcommittee the continuing value that you believe the United Nations has and the positive aspects that it continues to have over our foreign policy.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. I would be happy to do that, Congressman.

I might preface it by saying I very often do that in public places, too, but it never makes the news media.

Mr. LEVINE. It doesn't seem to, that is true.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. But, in fact, the public record is quite clear on it.

I believe that, first of all, that the large majority of the independent agencies of the United Nations, the humanitarian and scientific agencies—several of which I already mentioned, UNHCR, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO—these perform very, very valuable functions which the world needs performing and offer exactly the kind of humanitarian and scientific functions which Americans and

American taxpayers and legislators have always been interested in supporting and certainly should be, in my opinion, today.

And I may say that U.S. contributions to those agencies have increased in the years that I have been associated with the United Nations.

I could go into detail about the extraordinary work of the High Commissioner on Refugees whose camps I have visited. For example, on the Thai-Cambodia border, Pakistan-Afghanistan border, where there is 3 million Afghanistan refugees; on the border between El Salvador and Honduras I visited a camp with 6,000 Salvadorian refugees.

I would like to say simply that the work of UNHCR is, as I have seen it, just deeply effective, moving and necessary. I think that the UNICEF success in utilizing the technology of modern nutrition and medicine to virtually eradicate malnutrition and childhood diseases in a good many areas is stunning.

I think, by the way, that the World Health Organization, whose work I have already mentioned several times, is a very good example of what kinds of constructive tasks nations can accomplish if they will cooperate with each other instead of in fact worrying with one another. They are all kinds of historic scourges of mankind, like plague, TB, diptheria, and polio which have been virtually eliminated; small pox has been virtually eliminated from the face of the Earth in significant measure through the harnessing by WHO modern medical technology, so forth and so on.

I think that with regard to basic core institutions of the United Nations, the Security Council and the General Assembly, that is where we encounter the problems, of course. The peacekeeping operations that the United Nations carries out in Cyprus and in Golan and in Lebanon I think are positive, constructive, successful by and large in the sense that what they do is serve as a buffer between warring groups with their consent.

I wish today, very much, that we could move U.N. observers into the Shouf in the larger area around Beirut. Syria and the Soviets are unfortunately blocking that so far. I think the U.N. observers do a first-class job in that peacekeeping field. I think the Security Council has been unfortunately very deeply hampered by the actual divisions in the world, political divisions in the world, superpower rivalry it is called there. The Secretary General's reports have been a valuable contribution to facing these problems.

I believe, and I have said in many public places, that the United States and our best friends in the other democracies were somewhat remiss in the last decade in permitting some patterns of politics to develop in the General Assembly and Security Council which were hostile to democratic values and interests, but I think we are making progress in restoring those, and I think it is very important to continue working to that end.

Mr. LEVINE. I appreciate that answer. I know that I, for one, find myself at times exasperated and infuriated by what I read comes out of the United Nations, and yet I try to remember a lot of the things that you just reminded us of in your response to my last question.

I think it is useful during some of the times of consternation that we all have to remember these extremely positive humanitarian

multinational successes that have continued to come out of the United Nations and for whom our contribution is absolutely essential.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick, at the beginning of this hearing I accused you of integrity, intelligence, effectiveness, and eloquence, and one of the qualities that I haven't yet mentioned has been your candor in dealing with and in the United Nations.

I would like to explore the role of candor on the part of the U.S. representative in that body.

It seems to me as a student of the United Nations, since its founding, that both you and Ambassador Moynihan brought a degree of candor to our dealings with the United Nations which was enormously refreshing, and while many have viewed it as being hostile to the United Nations, in my judgment this candor was designed to restore to whatever extent it is feasible the moral authority of the United Nations because, glossing over outrages within the United Nations is both patronizing to the delegates involved and patronizing to the entire organization.

My question basically is this: Stipulating that we all want a United Nations to continue here in New York, to become stronger, from an American point of view it is critical that we build public support for the United Nations which has eroded to such a large extent and it seems to me that the way to build public support for the United Nations is, (a) to bring fiscal integrity to the body, and (b) to point out as eloquently as you have, irresponsible behavior whenever we find it.

If my assumptions are accurate, would you agree that those of us who would like to see some fiscal discipline within the United Nations, far from attacking and undermining the United Nations, are in fact working toward a greater degree of respect and, therefore, support on the part of the American people for the United Nations.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Thank you, Congressman Lantos. I feel that very deeply. Let me say that I think for example, Senator Moynihan being at the United Nations as he was during the dreadful season that the General Assembly adopted its sick formula, Zionism is racism, was confronted very clearly with the need to make, to combat that, that immoral act, and that immoral slogan as effectively as he could, to call it by its own name, which is bigotry and revolting, in fact.

I think that this whole process of the delegitimization of Israel by the passage of Zionism is racism resolution, was a landmark, has been surely one of the United Nations most dismal hours.

Unfortunately, it didn't go on for an hour; it is a process that went on for more than a decade and which gathered both steam and venom as it progressed.

I say that one may think you know that words don't matter and so what, the United Nations adopts a resolution. I was very struck by what I encountered in Burundi last year when I was there heading the U.S. delegation to the celebration of Burundi's 20th anniversary.

They had a long parade. The parade lasted some 6 hours, in fact, and many of the people of Burundi were present who took part in

the parade and I think had slogans and floats which celebrated most of the activities and occupations in Burundi. In the midst of this very, very constructive celebration, happy celebration of Burundi's People's Society Government, suddenly there came a large banner, 6 foot wide, at least, and 3 or 4 feet high, which says "Zionism is racism."

Here in the center of Africa, in a place, to put it mildly, where Zionism could hardly be an item, we should say the State of Israel should hardly be a high item in their consciousness, much less in their hit list.

We encountered this extraordinary slogan. What was it, that is cultural dissemination? It is simply I think that hate-filled acts like that spread around the world and seep into the consciousness of peoples in very remote places.

I think it is very important to face the destructiveness of hateful rhetoric. I think it is very important to oppose U.N. actions when they are antidemocratic, anti-West, anti-Israel.

When I first came to the United Nations, in the Security Council more than half of our total time was spent in attacks on Israel; in fact, both the Security Council and General Assembly. It is quite extraordinary.

This had nothing to do, by the way, with the Lebanese action. It was well in advance of that or any of the more controversial policies.

It was simply a major effort of the delegitimization of a member state. There was effort to suspend Israeli participation, to expel Israel from the institution.

Last year we launched—we, the United States undertook—a very strong campaign against that. We had the help of other countries. We barely defeated it.

I think it was very important for us to have talked clearly about that problem to have faced what it was we were dealing with, to face the extent to which it violates and perverts the United Nations itself, violating the charters and perverts the organization.

I think that if we are committed to the United Nations, what we are committed to is not a building; it is not a particular program. What we are committed to is the charter of the United Nations and the principles under the charter and which we affirmed in signing that treaty and I believe that those who are uncommitted to the United Nations will work as hard as we can to try to keep the organization faithful to those principles.

Mr. LANTOS. Ambassador Kirkpatrick, I would like to take you back to the Korean Airline episode and ask you what your analysis is for the reluctance that several member states demonstrated in being unwilling to go along with what appeared to most of us as a very modest and reasoned statement?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Yes. I would begin by saying that I think that resolution was moderate; it was a very moderate resolution which many countries felt was in fact too restrained in its characterization of shooting down of the Korean airliner.

The countries, the politics of the UN, I said it was like a State legislature; the politics of the United Nations tends to be dominated by blocs. That is even true in the Security Council, and some

nations, many nations in fact, just vote regularly with one or the other of blocs and very rarely deviate from them.

The countries which abstained in that case are countries which very, very rarely vote with any position that the Western nations take where the Soviets are taking a different position.

That is to say, they virtually never vote against the position taken by the Soviet Union or Soviet bloc.

That is just a fact. It is unfortunate, but it is true.

I may say we have made a bit of progress in encouraging countries to consider issues on their merits and to vote issues on their merits and not simply reflectively as members of the bloc. I would like to say in the Security Council on this Korean airliner vote, there are 8 members of the 15 members of the Security Council who are also members of the nonalined caucus and 5 of those members of the nonalined caucus voted in favor of the resolution.

Only three, in fact, either abstained or voted no.

Mr. LANTOS. You mentioned the Soviet Union a minute ago. There has been a great deal of speculation about the impact of Mr. Gromyko's nonappearance at the current session of the United Nations. In the first place, for the record, am I correct in assuming that it was his choice not to come entirely; that we were fully prepared to receive him, and in fact provided a perfectly secure and safe and comfortable place for him to land; so he was not excluded, is that right?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. No, no, he certainly was not. We provided alternative landing facilities which were convenient and nearby and perfectly secure.

Mr. LANTOS. Would you care to speculate as to why he chose not to come? Was it to avoid the embarrassment of the post-Korea episode?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. You know, Congressman Lantos, I have been very interested in speculating privately, quietly, to myself, about why he chose not to come. I think it is the most interesting question of the season, so to speak. I feel sure that it was not because he thought there would be inconvenience or lack of security for him if he came. A large Soviet delegation did come after all.

I think maybe he thought he would be very uncomfortable and sought to make propaganda points, turn the debate away from the horror of the act of shooting down the airliner, some sort of contention that the United States wouldn't let him in or something.

I think it is also possible that there are interesting processes going on inside the political elite at this point which we are not fully aware of.

In other words, what I am saying is that I think there may be reasons of internal Soviet politics which may have affected Secretary Gromyko's decision not to come. I think that.

We also don't know why the Soviets requested a postponement of their speech last week, the day of the President's speech, I guess they also postponed their own speech until October 4.

We still really do not know who will deliver that speech or what it will say. I think there are very strong indications in the wind that suggest there are interesting machinations going on inside the Soviet Government.

Mr. LANTOS. I have two quick questions. The first one relates to the quotas of the U.S. national level, representing at all levels in appropriate numbers, what is the status of that?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. That is informal.

Mr. LANTOS. I know.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. We don't think that we have as many high level officials inside the U.N. bureaucracy as we should have. We certainly don't have as many as we used to have. However, in all fairness I would like to say that most other nations feel the same way. They feel they don't have enough, as many as they deserve, or certainly would like to have.

It was inevitable that, as the organization grew in size, our share of the bureaucracy should decline. We continuously work with the Secretariat to try to increase the number of Americans at high levels.

We are not satisfied. We will go on working on it.

Mr. LANTOS. My final question relates to the office of the Secretary General, not to the individual operation of that office.

A short while ago several of us had breakfast with the Secretary General who, in response to my questions, stated that he is determined not to run for reelection.

As you know, he has stated this publicly and privately on countless occasions.

Leaving aside the fact of the Presidential incumbent, do you think that there is merit in fixing the term of the Secretary General at one term so as to obviate his need to curry favor with the powers that basically determine whether he can be reelected or not.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Yes, I would like to say that I firmly, on constitutional grounds, oppose the one 6-year term for the president, but I think I support one 5-year term for the Secretary General.

The Secretary General is not supposed to be a political officer, a political leader, and I do believe, unlike the President, who is supposed to be a political leader, I do believe that the possibility of reelection does tend to politicize the office and the men somewhat and I think that the current Secretary General's position on that is an appropriate one.

Mr. LANTOS. Final question, Ambassador Kirkpatrick. Assuming that this administration will remain in office for another 4 years, which I fervently hope will not be the case, are you prepared to serve for another 4 years in your present post?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. No, I am not, Congressman Lantos.

Mr. LANTOS. Thank you very much.

Mr. YATRON. Thank you, Mr. Lantos.

Madam Ambassador, you mentioned WHO as a well-managed agency. What is your view of how the Senate cut would affect ability of the World Health Organization to carry out its major responsibility, especially its role in the Children's Health Revolution?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Congressman Yatron, I couldn't answer with specific regard to a specific program like children's health field without more investigation in fact.

But, I would say that obviously the current Senate resolution would impose a substantial cut and a substantial cut would be felt

by the organization and its programs in a substantial way. I don't have any doubt about that at all.

Mr. YATRON. One final question. If the Congress adopts the Senate amendment, would you recommend to the President that he veto the bill, or would you expect him to veto the bill?

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Congressman, I hope you will forgive me but I always say I refuse to comment on my recommendations to the President.

I think I have made clear what my position on that amendment is and I certainly would share those views with the President. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. YATRON. Well, we thank you, Madam Ambassador.

I have three additional questions from Mr. Wolpe, a member of the full committee, who would like a response for the record. They are specifically related to Africa. So we will submit those to you and we would appreciate it if you would respond to those questions.[1]

I want to say in conclusion, thank you again for testifying before the subcommittee and also for your very generous commitment of time. We look forward to working with you toward a constructive solution to the U.N. budget problem.

Ambassador KIRKPATRICK. Thank you, Congressman Yatron.

Mr. YATRON. The subcommittee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 5 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

---

[1] See appendix 6

APPENDIX 1

Kassebaum Amendment

Restrictions on assessed payments to the United Nations

Sec. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States assessed payments for the calendar year 1984 to the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization shall not exceed its assessed payments to each such organization for the calendar year 1980. Such payments to each such organization for the calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 shall be no more than 90 per centum, 80 per centum, and 70 per centum, respectively, of the amount of the assessments paid to each such organization for the calendar year 1980.

(b) No payment may be made to an organization referred to in subsection (a) for the calendar years 1985, 1986, and 1987 unless payments made pursuant to this section are accepted by the respective organization as payment in full of the United States assessment towards the finanicial support of such organization.

APPENDIX 2

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1983.

Hon. GUS YATRON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been asked to provide you with a statement of the Administration's position on the Kassebaum Amendment to the Department of State's Authorization Bill.

The Administration opposes this Amendment because it would place the United States in breach of its international obligations in a manner that would jeopardize United States voting rights in the affected international organizations. We support authorization of the amounts originally requested.

While we share many of the concerns that precipitated this action and agree the United Nations has its deficiencies, we feel the United States interests are best served by constructive participation in the United Nations' family of organizations.

Sincerely,

KENNETH W. DAM,
Acting Secretary.

APPENDIX 3

Text of Press Release Dated September 19, 1983, by the U.S. Mission to the United Nations Regarding Ambassador Lichenstein's Remarks

Ambassador Lichenstein's remarks this morning in the United Nations Host Country Relations Committee should be understood in the broader context in which they were made. He was responding to a hostile attack by the Soviet delegate who charged, among other things, that the United States was not a suitable host country for the United Nations because it was conspiring to violate its obligations to the U.N. The same theme, it should be recalled, was touched on in the TASS statement last Saturday which announced that Foreign Minister Gromyko would not be attending in the session of the U.N. General Assembly that begins tomorrow.

Ambassador Lichenstein called these charges "A palpable falsehood," as indeed they are. The United States believes that, in making arrangements for Mr. Gromyko's safe and prompt arrival here, it is fully living up to both the letter and the spirit of our obligations as Host Country. These obligations, we believe, do not permit U.N. diplomats to fly in any time, anywhere, or by any means they choose. They do mean that convenient, safe, normal travel to and from the U.N. should be available. Just such travel is available to Mr. Gromyko. He is free to travel to the U.S. by any commerical airline in the world other than Aeroflot, which other Soviet delegates to the General Assembly will do. Or, if he prefers, he is free to arrive by Soviet military aircraft and land at a convenient, near-by airbase. In fact, the U.S. decision regarding Mr. Gromyko would have allowed him to enter the U.S. even after security consideriations had led the governors of New York and New Jersey to close civilian airports to Aeroflot planes.

The United States takes its respsonsibilities as Host Country seriously, and worked very hard at making conditions here as secure and pleasant as possible. To suggest, as the Soviet delegate did today, that the U.S. is unfit to be Host Country because of Mr. Gromyko's decision not to come to this General Assembly, is in fact a provocation—to which Ambassador Lichenstein responded accordingly. His remarks should be understood as a response to a deliberate provocation, not as any new departure in U.S. policy.

APPENDIX 4

Remarks of President Reagan to Regional Editors and Broadcasters on September 21, 1983, Regarding Ambassador Lichenstein's Statement About the United Nations Leaving the United States

Question. What about the U.N.? We have been hearing a lot about the U.N., that it would move for (inaudible). What are your thoughts?

The President. Well, I think that the gentleman who spoke for us the other day—we're three questions past that last question here. (Laughter.) I think the gentleman who spoke the other day had the hearty approval of most people in America in his suggestion that we weren't asking anyone to leave, but if they chose to leave, goodby. Jeane Kirkpatrick has made an interesting suggestion also that should be thought about. But maybe all of those delegates should have six months in the United Nations' meetings in Moscow and then six months in New York, and it would give them an opportunity to see two ways of life.

Question. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. And we'd permit them.

APPENDIX 5

Comparison of U.N. and U.S. Civil Service Salaries and Take Home Pay

United Nations			United States		
Rank	Gross Salary	Take Home Pay	Rank	Gross Salary	Take Home Pay
P-1	25,629	22,595	GS- 9	20,256	17,420
P-2	33,551	28,512	GS-11	24,508	20,832
P-3	41,734	34,319	GS-12	29,374	24,234
			GS-13	34,930	27,944
P-4	51,526	40,970	GS-14	41,277	32,198
P-5	64,599	49,256	GS-15	48,553	36,900
D-1	73,261	54,281	SES	63,800	47,850
D-2	86,107	61,270	SES	63,800	47,850

"Gross Salary" for the UN includes net salary at step 1 of the grade shown for an employee with one or more dependents, corresponding staff assessment, and post adjustment at the level paid in New York City. "Take home pay" deducts staff assessment from gross figures. No allowances are included in the take home pay figures, nor are retirement contributions or other payroll deductions. On the U.S. side, gross salary is the amount payable for Step 1 of GS grades and level 4 of the SES; take home pay is an average after tax figure, based on IRS tables.

GS-9 and P-1 are equivalent grades. Higher numbered P and GS grades are nearly but not exactly comparable. The SES is an equivalent for the UN's D grades. Take home pay is about 30 per cent greater for a P-1 than a GS-9; the same advantage is enjoyed by a D-2 compared to an SES employee.

Submitted by Ambassador Kirkpatrick

32-616 O - 84 - 2

APPENDIX 6

Letter Dated Dec. 2, 1983 to Hon. Jeane Kirkpatrick, Department of State, From Subcommittee Chairman Yatron

December 2, 1983

The Honorable Jeane Kirkpatrick
U.S. Permanent Representative
to the United Nations
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Dear Ambassador Kirkpatrick:

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for taking the time out from your busy schedule to testify before the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations on the United States' role in the United Nations.

As I indicated at the end of our October 3rd hearing, I have three additional questions for which Congressman Howard Wolpe, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, would like a response.

The questions are as follows:

1. During the past two years there has developed a pattern of delayed payments of voluntary contributions (specifically Africa-related) by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. to the U.N. Secretariat. Certain of these payments were originally delayed due to an investigation requested and carried out by the Bureau of International Organization Affairs and the U.S. Mission to the U.N. If it has been completed, what were the results?

2. Do these delays, which are often 6 or more months behind their obligation, have anything to do with the Congressional prohibition on giving funds to the South West African Peoples' Organization (SWAPO)? It is our understanding that assurances have been given by the U.N. Secretariat that American contributions are not going to other U.N. support funds for SWAPO. Is that your understanding as well?

3. Recently, it has come to our attention that fiscal year 1983 funds authorized and appropriated for the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa have not been forwarded to the U.N. by the State Department. A good part of these funds are used to provide adequate counsel to black South African defendants who would not otherwise have access to appropriate representation before the South African courts. Can you tell us why these funds' obligation has been delayed since none of these funds are directed to SWAPO?

Again, I want to thank you for your appearance before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

Gus Yatron

Gus Yatron
Chairman
Subcommittee on Human Rights
and International Organizations

APPENDIX 7

Questions Submitted to Ambassador Kirkpatrick From Subcommittee Chairman Yatron, and Responses Thereto

Q. During the past two years, there has developed a pattern of delayed payment of voluntary contributions (specifically Africa-related) by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. to the U.N. Secretariat. Certain of these payments were originally delayed due to an investigation requested and carried out by the Bureau of International Organization Affairs and the U.S. Mission to the U.N. Is this investigation still underway? If it has been completed, what were the results?

A. In the formal sense of the word, there has been no "investigation" of the Africa-related U.N. funds, i.e., the U.N. Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa (UNETPSA), the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa (UNTFSA), and the United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN). However, we have had to delay the payment of the U.S. voluntary contributions to these U.N. Funds, and in the meantime, to withhold a part of the funds appropriated by Congress for some of them, to determine how much, if any, of the U.S. contribution would have to be held back either as a precautionary action or permanently because of the proportionate share reduction provisions with respect to SWAPO in Section 203 of P.L. 97-216, and Section 154 of P.L. 97-377.

Q. Do these delays, which often are 6 or more months behind their obligation, have anything to do with the congressional prohibition on giving funds to the South West African People's Organizations (SWAPO)? It is our understanding that assurances have been given by the U.N. Secretariat that U.S. contributions are not going to other U.N. support funds for SWAPO. Is that your understanding as well?

A. See the previous answer. In the case of UNIN, for example, the U.N. was not able to give a final accounting of its SWAPO-related expenses for 1982 until mid-July 1983. We have now identified $6,076 of "programs...for SWAPO" within the overall UNIN program and, as a consequence, are withholding $1,288 (21.2%) from our total FY-1982 pledge of $500,000.

Q. Recently, it has come to our attention that fiscal year 1983 funds authorized and appropriated for the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa have not been forwarded to the U.N. by the State Department. A good part of these funds are used to provide adequate counsel to black South African defendants who would not otherwise have access to appropriate representation in South African courts. Can you tell us why these funds' obligation has been delayed, since none of the funds are directed to SWAPO?

A. The initial FY-1983 U.S. payment of $257,250 to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa (UNTFSA) was forwarded to our Mission in New York on September 29, 1983, for onward transmission to the U.N. We are now processing a check for the remaining $85,750 of our total FY-1983 pledge of $343,000. We have accepted the assurances of the U.N. Secretariat and the office of the Chairman of the UNTFSA Advisory Committee that none of the expenditures of UNTFSA in FY-1983 will be for "programs for...SWAPO" in contravention of Section 154 of P.L. 97-377.

APPENDIX 8

Summary of Benefits and Achievements of the United Nations System, Prepared by the U.N. Information Center

Peace and Security

Important contributions to peace have been made through the introduction of UN Peacekeeping forces, observers, and special representatives into troubled areas of the world. Such United Nations efforts have helped to end hostilities and prevent their recurrence in the Congo, Cyprus, the Golan Hights, and other parts of the Middle East where the situation would be even more explosive if not for UN efforts.

The General Assembly has passed resolutions calling for settlement of the conflict in Afganistan and the withdrawal of foreign forces. It has also ordered an investigation into the possible uses of chemical weapons in Afganistan and Kampuchea.

Resolutions to combat terrorism against diplomats, on the international refugee problem and on religious intolerance have also been supported by a majority of the members of the Assembly.

The United Nations provides a "safety valve" function, allowing hostilities to be reflected in debate rather than on the battlefield.

As a setting for "quiet diplomacy" and informal consultations, the UN provides a place where matters may be discussed informally and discretely, avoiding the polarization of viewpoints which often results from publicity or negotiation in the mass media.

The Secretary General's availability for "good offices" missions and his stature as an impartial world leader allow him to be of service in fact-finding, mediation, and conciliation efforts. He is able to communicate with almost any country or group in the world today that may be involved in a conflict or dispute.

The United Nations is an international organization, not a sovereign institution or a world government. As such, its effectiveness depends on the leadership, support, and will of the member states. It is useful to recall that the United Nations organization was created around a core of victorious allies after World War II. Its effectiveness was predicated on a cooperative working relationship among the five permanent members of the Security Council (United States, USSR, France, Great Britain, and China), each of whom holds veto power in the Council.

Economic, Social, and Humanitarian Matters

- The United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) has been an important catalyst in reducing pollution of the Mediterranean Sea. Through the efforts of UNEP, cooperation of states in the region, some of whom do not have diplomatic relations with one another, has been secured toward a goal upon which all agree.

- Smallpox has been wiped out under a campaign coordinated by the World Health Organization.

- An early warning system for impending grain and other food scarcities has been set up under the Food and Agricultural Organization.

- Some 405 million persons have been innoculated against a variety of fatal and disabling diseases under the United Nations Children's Fund and World Health Organization programmes.

- Airlines all over the world operate more safely because of rules and regulations agreed upon under the auspices of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

- Some 8,000 development projects in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America are aided through the United Nations Development Programme.

- Aid for refugees, like those in Africa and Asia, is coordinated and directed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

- Labor standards set by the International Labor Organization have made life safer and better for millions of workers around the world.

- Precious relics of human history, such as the Egyptian temples of Abu Simbel and the Acropolis in Greece, are being saved with the help of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

- The International Atomic Energy Agency applies safeguards to ensure that nuclear materials and equipment intended for peaceful use are not diverted to military purposes.

- Organizations such as the Universal Postal Union and the International Telecommunications Union perform routine "traffic cop" functions which are essential for smooth and efficient international communications.

- Financial institutions such as the IMF and World Bank assist in the development process and aid in maintaining stable international monetary conditions, essential to the growth and maintenance of international trade. By assisting the less developed countries in improving their economic situations, international financial institutions help the industrialized nations who rely on exports as a major contributor to economic growth and job creation.

Financial and Budgetary Data

The budget figures shown below are for the United Nations organization only and do not include the specialized agencies and voluntary programs which are listed later in the section.

Total regular budget spending (1981): $683 million
The United States share was: 25% (approximately $170 million)

In comparison with other spending it is useful to note that the budget for the New York City police department is larger than the United Nations regular budget. In addition, Sweden's United Nations ambassador has pointed out that it would take no more than the price of seven new

strategic bombers to finance the United Nations regular budget. He also noted that spending on dog and cat food in the United States supermarkets in 1979 was some $3.2 billion -- more than six times the annual expenditure of the United Nations.

Each member state of the United Nations is assigned a percentage share of the budget, ranging from a minimum of .01% to a maximum of 25%. This percentage share is based on a country's "ability to pay", measured mainly by national income.

Of the total gross domestic product (GDP) of the world in 1980 -- which amounted to $5,133 billion in constant 1975 prices, including goods but excluding services -- the United States accounted for $1,121 billion, or about 22%. Under the formula used for calculating the United Nations assessment, as described above, the United States share would be higher than the 25% it is currently assessed.

In addition to assessed contributions discussed above, a number of countries make voluntary contributions to the United Nations, mainly for activities related to development assistance and refugee relief. In 1980, the total assessed contributions for the entire United Nations system were $1.4 billion, and the voluntary contributions amounted to over $2.4 billion.

Seeing in terms of per capita contributions to the United Nations (contributions to the entire system, including voluntary contributions), in 1980 the top ten were:

1.	Norway	$39.0 per person
2.	Sweden	$32.0
3.	Denmark	$27.1
4.	Qatar	$18.5
5.	Netherlands	$18.4
6.	Switzerland	$10.2
7.	Saudi Arabia	$9.7
8.	Canada	$9.2
9.	United Arab Emirates	$9.1
10.	Libya	$7.4.

The United States' per capita contribution amounted to $4.1; Federal Republic of Germany, $4.6; United Kingdom, $3.4; Japan, $3; France, $2.6; Italy, $1.4; Soviet Union, $0.6; and Spain, $0.5.

Below are United Nations Secretariat purchasing statistics for 1982 in millions of dollars:

Total UN purchase orders worldwide	$53.4 million
Total UN purchase orders placed in the United States	$38.6 million
Percentage of total worldwide purchase orders placed in the United States	72.3%

* *** *

APPENDIX 9

President Reagan's September 25th Speech at a Reception for the Heads of Delegations to the 38th General Assembly

[Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Volume 19, No. 39]

United Nations

REMARKS AT A RECEPTION FOR THE HEADS OF DELEGATIONS TO THE 38TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. SEPTEMBER 25, 1983

George, thank you very much. Ambassador Kirkpatrick, Mr. Mayor, and distinguished guests and friends:

Thank you for coming this evening. And on behalf of all my fellow citizens, let me welcome you to the United States as we gather for the 38th Session of the U.N. General Assembly. The United States is proud to be home of this organization whose purpose is to bring peace to all the people of the planet, and your presence honors our nation.

I'm looking forward to addressing the General Assembly tomorrow because I bring a message that's very important to me personally, to my country, and I believe to all the members of the U.N. I've come to speak before the General Assembly because, like so many others, I'm disturbed by the drift of world events in recent weeks. I still believe the United Nations is an effective forum for not only discussing our problems but doing something about them.

As much as the Korean airline tragedy has been on my mind over the past few weeks, tonight I want to say just a few words about another tragedy that has been troubling me greatly—the one that is occurring in Lebanon, that beautiful, prosperous land which was once a model of coexistence among peoples and faiths. It has been shattered by violence for reasons which are especially complex.

Our goal, as well as the United Nations, is the territorial integrity, the sovereignty, and the political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. It's long been clear that we can best fulfill this role by working to strengthen the legitimate Government of Lebanon, by negotiating the withdrawal of all external forces, and by promoting a cease-fire and national reconciliation among Lebanese communities.

At the request of the Lebanese Government, my nation, as you know, joined with France, Italy, and hte United Kingdom in sending peacekeeping troops to give Lebanon a chance to pull itself together while our diplomats continue to search for internal agreement and an end to external intervention.

Well, just a short while ago, today, welcome news flashed across the Middle East that a cease-fire has officially been declared. Within a few hours, it is hoped that guns will finally be stilled. No one can underestimate the challenges that still lie ahead. Lebanon has been racked by so many conflicting forces for so long that the building of peace and national reconciliation will be very formidable tasks. But this is the critical first step. We hope it marks a new beginning in Lebanon, a period of calm when Lebanon can began to reclaim its nationhood free of outside forces and the threat of new bloodshed.

The coming days must be a time for restraint and reconciliation by all parties. We in the United States will continue to be as helpful as we can in this process, and I hope and pray there will be U.N. observers on hand to help in that process.

Let me say that President Gemayel of Lebanon has shown true statesmanship during this period. The Secretary-General and I spoke with him by telephone earlier today to congratulate him on this cease-fire and to wish him well. The assistance of Saudi Arabia, the cooperation of Syria have also been indispensable during this process.

Finally, if I may, can I congratulate those who have served in the peacekeeping forces in Lebanon as well as two of our own United States diplomats, Robert McFar-

lane and Richard Fairbanks. All of them have played an enormously constructive role and they, too, must share in our happiness this evening.

We must all remember that what is at stake in Lebanon is a vital principle of international law and international morality, a principle at the heart of the U.N. Charter. A country's right to decide for itself how best to achieve its sovereign objectives, free of occupation, threat, and blackmail—that is what the goal must be. The people of the United States have no driving desire to become involved in the internal affairs of other nations. Contrary to what some have alleged, we have no objectives of our own in Lebanon beyond peace for its people and freedom from external intervention. We would prefer that everyone just mind their own business and live their lives peacefully, but we recognize that as a major power we have major responsibilities. In good conscience, we can't turn our back on those responsibilities.

The problems of Lebanon, important in their own right, are at the same time a part of the greater question of peace for all of the Middle East. We remain committed to the principles I outlined on September 1st, 1982, which were based on U.N. Security Council Resolution 242, 338, and the Camp David accords. The United States will not let up in its efforts to promote a just and lasting, comprehensive negotiated peace so that the nations and peoples of the Middle East can live together in peace.

In closing, let me say that I've come to New York this year because I want to reaffirm that the United States of America will continue to work constructively in the United Nations and in every other forum to help resolve conflicts, to support the forces of peace and international civility, and to promote economic cooperation and prosperity. We believe arms reductions are of particular importance. The commitment of the United States to the goals of the U.N. Charter is unwavering. In the cause of peace, my country will play its part and carry its share of the burden.

Thank you all.

NOTE.—The President spoke at 7:08 p.m. in the Hilton Room of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick made welcoming remarks and introduced Mayor Edward Koch of New York City and Secretary of State George P. Shultz, who then introduced the President. The reception was hosted by the United States for heads of state, foreign ministers, and heads of delegations to the United Nations session.

APPENDIX 10

Current
Policy No. 511

President Reagan

Renewing the U.S. Commitment to Peace

September 26, 1983

United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is President Reagan's address to the 38th session of the UN General Assembly, September 26, 1983.

Thank you for granting me the honor of speaking today, on this first day of general debate in the 38th session of the General Assembly. Once again I come before this body preoccupied with peace. Last year I stood in this chamber to address the Special Session on Disarmament. I have come today to renew my nation's commitment to peace. And I have come to discuss how we can keep faith with the dreams that created this organization.

The United Nations was founded in the aftermath of World War II to protect future generations from the scourge of war, to promote political self-determination and global prosperity, and to strengthen the bonds of civility among nations. The founders sought to replace a world at war with a world of civilized order. They hoped that a world of relentless conflict would give way to a new era, one where freedom from violence prevailed.

Whatever challenges the world was bound to face, the founders intended this body to stand for certain values, even if they could not be enforced, and to condemn violence, even if it could not be stopped. This body was to speak with the voice of moral authority. That was to be its greatest power.

But the awful truth is that the use of violence for political gain has become more, not less, widespread in the last decade. Events of recent weeks have presented new, unwelcome evidence of brutal disregard for life and truth. They have offered unwanted testimony on how divided and dangerous our world is, how quick the recourse to violence.

What has happened to the dreams of the United Nations' founders? What has happened to the spirit which created the United Nations? The answer is clear: governments got in the way of the dreams of the people. Dreams became issues of East versus West. Hopes became political rhetoric. Progress became a search for power and domination. Somewhere the truth was lost that people don't make wars, governments do.

And today in Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, and the North Pacific, the weapons of war shatter the security of the peoples who live there, endanger the peace of neighbors, and create ever more arenas of confrontation between the great powers. During the past year alone, violent conflicts have occurred in the hills around Beirut, the deserts of Chad and the Western Sahara, in the mountains of El Salvador, the streets of Suriname, the cities and countryside of Afghanistan, the borders of Kampuchea, and the battlefields of Iran and Iraq.

We cannot count on the instinct for survival to protect us against war. Despite all the wasted lives and hopes that war produces, it has remained a regular, if horribly costly, means by which nations have sought to settle their disputes or advance their goals.

The Search for Meaningful Arms Control Agreements

And the progress in weapons technology has far outstripped the progress toward peace. In modern times, a new, more terrifying element has entered into the calculations—nuclear weapons. A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. I believe that if governments are determined to deter and prevent war, there will not be war. Nothing is more in keeping with the spirit of the UN Charter than arms control.

When I spoke before the Second Special Session on Disarmament, I affirmed the U.S. Government's commitment, and my personal commitment, to reduce nuclear arms and to negotiate in good faith toward that end.

Today, I reaffirm those commitments. The United States has already reduced the number of its nuclear weapons worldwide and, while replacement of older weapons is unavoidable, we wish to negotiate arms reductions and to achieve significant, equitable, verifiable arms control agreements. And let me add, we must ensure that world security is not undermined by the further spread of nuclear weapons. Nuclear nonproliferation must not be the forgotten element of the world's arms control agenda.

At the time of my last visit here, I expressed hope that a whole class of weapons systems—the longer range INF (the intermediate-range nuclear forces) missiles—could be banned from the face of the earth. I believe that to relieve the deep concern of peoples in both Europe and Asia, the time was ripe, for the first time in history, to resolve a security threat exclusively through arms control. I still believe the elimination of these weapons—the zero option—is the best, fairest, most practical solution to this problem. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union declined to accept the total elimination of this class of weapons.

When I was here last, I hoped that the critical strategic arms reduction talks (START) would focus, and urgently so, on those systems that carry the greatest risk of nuclear war—the fast-flying, accurate intercontinental ballistic missiles which pose a first strike potential. I also hoped the negotiations could reduce by one-half the number of strategic missiles on each side and reduce their warheads by one-third. Again, I was disappointed when the Soviets declined to consider such deep cuts and refused, as well, to concentrate on these most dangerous destabilizing weapons.

Despite the rebuffs, the United States has not abandoned and will not abandon the search for meaningful arms control agreements. Last June, I proposed a new approach toward the START negotiations. We did not alter our objective of substantial reductions, but we recognized that there are a variety of ways to achieve this end. During the last round of Geneva talks, we presented a draft treaty which responded to a number of concerns raised by the Soviet Union. We will continue to build upon this initiative.

Similarly, in our negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces, when the Soviet leaders adamantly refused to consider the total elimination of these weapons, the United States made a new offer. We proposed, as an interim solution, some equal number on both sides between zero and 572. We recommended the lowest possible level.

Once again, the Soviets refused an equitable solution and proposed instead what might be called a "half-zero option"—zero for us and many hundreds of warheads for them. And that's where things stand today, but I still have not given up hope that the Soviet Union will enter into serious negotiations.

We are determined to spare no effort to achieve a sound, equitable, and verifiable agreement. And for this reason, I have given new instructions to Ambassador Nitze [head of the U.S. delegation to the INF negotiations] in Geneva, telling him to put forward a package of steps designed to advance the negotiations as rapidly as possible. These initiatives build on the interim framework the United States advanced last March and address concerns that the Soviets have raised at the bargaining table in the past. Specifically:

First, the United States proposes a new initiative on global limits. If the Soviet Union agrees to reductions and limits on a global basis, the United States, for its part, will not offset the entire Soviet global missile deployment through U.S. deployments in Europe. We would, of course, retain the right to deploy missiles elsewhere.

Second, the United States is prepared to be more flexible on the content of the current talks. The United States will consider mutually acceptable ways to address the Soviet desire that an agreement should limit aircraft as well as missiles.

Third, the United States will address the mix of missiles that would result from reductions. In the context of reductions to equal levels, we are prepared to reduce the number of Pershing II ballistic missiles as well as ground-launched cruise missiles.

I have decided to put forward these important initiatives after full and extensive consultations with our allies, including personal correspondence I've had with the leaders of the NATO governments and Japan and frequent meetings of the NATO Special Consultative Group. I have also stayed in close touch with other concerned friends and allies. The door to an agreement is open. It is time for the Soviet Union to walk through it.

I want to make an unequivocal pledge to those gathered today in this world arena. The United States seeks and will accept any equitable, verifiable agreement that stabilizes forces at lower levels than currently exist. We are ready to be flexible in our approach, indeed, willing to compromise. We cannot, however, especially in light of recent events, compromise on the necessity of effective verification.

Reactions to the Korean airliner tragedy are a timely reminder of just how different the Soviets' concept of truth and international cooperation is from that of the rest of the world. Evidence abounds that we cannot simply assume that agreements negotiated with the Soviet Union will be fulfilled. We negotiated the Helsinki Final Act, but the promised freedoms have not been provided and those in the Soviet Union who sought to monitor their fulfillment languish in prison. We negotiated a Biological Weapons Convention, but deadly yellow rain and other toxic agents fall on Hmong villages and Afghan encampments. We have negotiated arms agreements, but the high level of Soviet encoding hides the information needed for their verification. A newly discovered radar facility and a new ICBM [intercontinental ballistic missile] raise serious concerns about Soviet compliance with agreements already negotiated.

Peace cannot be served by pseudo arms control. We need reliable, reciprocal reductions. I call upon the Soviet Union today to reduce the tensions it has heaped on the world in the past few weeks and to show a firm commitment to peace by coming to the bargaining table with a new understanding of its obligations. I urge it to match our flexibility. If the Soviets sit down at the bargaining table seeking genuine arms reductions, there will be arms reductions. The governments of the West and their people will not be diverted by misinformation and threats. The time has come for the Soviet Union to show proof that it wants arms control in reality, not just in rhetoric.

Meaningful arms control agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union would make our world less dangerous; so would a number of confidence-building steps we've already proposed to the Soviet Union.

Call for a True Nonalignment of the United Nations

Arms control requires a spirit beyond narrow national interests. This spirit is a basic pillar on which the United Nations was founded. We seek a return to this spirit. A fundamental step would be a true nonalignment of the United Nations. This would signal a return to the true values of the charter, including the principle of universality. The members of the United Nations must be aligned on the side of justice rather than injustice, peace rather than aggression, human dignity rather than subjugation. Any other alignment is beneath the purpose of this great body and destructive of the harmony it seeks. What harms the charter harms peace.

The founders of the United Nations expected that member nations would behave and vote as individuals, after they had weighed the merits of an issue—rather like a great, global town meeting. The emergence of blocs and the polarization of the United Nations undermine all that this organization initially valued.

We must remember that the nonaligned movement was founded to counter the development of blocs and to promote detente between them. Its founders spoke of the right of smaller countries not to become involved in others' disagreements. Since then, membership in the nonaligned movement has grown dramatically, but not all the new members have shared the founders' commitment of genuine nonalignment. Indeed, client governments of the Soviet Union, who have long since lost their independence, have flocked into the nonaligned movement and once inside have worked against its true purpose. Pseudo nonalignment is no better than pseudo arms control.

The United States rejects as false and misleading the view of the world as divided between the empires of the East and West. We reject it on factual grounds. The United States does not head any bloc of subservient nations, nor do we desire to. What is called the West is a free alliance of governments, most of whom are democratic and all of whom greatly value their independence. What is called the East is an empire directed from the center which is Moscow.

The United States, today, as in the past, is a champion of freedom and self-determination for all people. We welcome diversity; we support the right of all nations to define and pursue their national goals. We respect their decisions and their sovereignty, asking only that they respect the decisions and sovereignty of others. Just look at the world over the last 30 years, and then decide for yourself whether the United States or the Soviet Union has pursued an expansionist policy.

Today, the United States contributes to peace by supporting collective efforts by the international community. We give our unwavering support to the peacekeeping efforts of this body, as well as other multilateral peacekeeping efforts around the world. The United Nations has a proud history of promoting conciliation and helping keep the peace. Today, UN peacekeeping forces or observers are present in Cyprus and Kashmir, on the Golan Heights, and in Lebanon.

In addition to our encouragement of international diplomacy, the United States recognizes its responsibilities to use its own influence for peace. From the days when Theodore Roosevelt mediated the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, we have a long and honorable tradition of mediating or dampening conflicts and promoting peaceful solutions. In Lebanon, we, along with France, Italy, and the United Kingdom, have worked for a cease-fire, for the withdrawal of all external forces, and for restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity. In Chad, we have joined others in supporting the recognized government in the face of external aggression. In Central America, as in southern Africa, we are seeking to discourage reliance upon force and to construct a framework for peaceful negotiations. We support a policy to disengage the major powers from Third World conflict.

The UN Charter gives an important role to regional organizations in the search for peace. The U.S. efforts in the cause of peace are only one expression of a spirit that also animates others in the world community. The Organization of American States was a pioneer in regional security efforts. In Central America, the members of the Contadora group are striving to lay a foundation for peaceful resolution of that region's problems. In East Asia, the Asian countries have built a framework for peaceful political and economic cooperation that has greatly strengthened the prospects for lasting peace in their region. In Africa, organizations such as the Economic Community of West African States are being forged to provide practical structures in the struggle to realize Africa's potential.

From the beginning, our hope for the United Nations has been that it would reflect the international community at its best. The United Nations at its best can help us transcend fear and violence and can act as an enormous force for peace and prosperity. Working together, we can combat international lawlessness and promote human dignity.

The Need to Uphold the UN's Original Ideals

If the governments represented in this chamber want peace as genuinely as their peoples do, we shall find it. We can do so by reasserting the moral authority of the United Nations. In recent weeks, the moral outrage of the world seems to have reawakened.

Out of the billions of people who inhabit this planet, why, some might ask, should the death of several hundred shake the world so profoundly? Why should the death of a mother flying toward a reunion with her family or the death of a scholar heading toward new pursuits of knowledge matter so deeply? Why are nations who lost no citizens in the tragedy so angry?

The reason rests on our assumptions about civilized life and the search for peace. The confidence that allows a mother or a scholar to travel to Asia or Africa or Europe or anywhere else on this planet may be only a small victory in humanity's struggle for peace. Yet what is peace if not the sum of such small victories?

Each stride for peace and every small victory are important for the journey toward a larger and lasting peace. We have made progress. We have avoided another world war. We have seen an end to the traditional colonial era and the birth of 100 newly sovereign nations. Even though development remains a formidable challenge, we have witnessed remarkable economic growth among the industrialized and the developing nations. The United Nations and its affiliates have made important contributions to the quality of life on this planet, such as directly saving countless lives through its refugee and emergency relief programs. These broad achievements, however, have been overshadowed by the problems that weigh so heavily upon us. The problems are old, but it is not too late to commit ourselves to a new beginning, a beginning fresh with the ideals of the UN Charter.

Today, at the beginning of this 38th Session, I solemnly pledge my nation to upholding the original ideals of the United Nations. Our goals are those that guide this very body. Our ends are the same as those of the United Nations' founders, who sought to replace a world at war with one where the rule of law would prevail, where human rights were honored, where development would blossom, where conflict would give way to freedom from violence.

In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower made an observation on weaponry and deterrence in a letter to a publisher. He wrote:

> When we get to the point, as we one day will, that both sides know that in any outbreak of general hostilities, regardless of the element of surprise, destruction will be both reciprocal and complete, possibly we will have sense enough to meet at the conference table with the understanding that the era of armaments has ended and the human race must conform its actions to this truth or die.

He went on to say:

> . . . we have already come to the point where safety cannot be assumed by arms alone . . . their usefulness becomes concentrated more and more in their characteristics as deterrents than in instruments with which to obtain victory. . . .

Distinguished ladies and gentlemen, as we persevere in the search for a more secure world, we must do everything we can to let diplomacy triumph. Diplomacy, the most honorable of professions, can bring the most blessed of gifts, the gift of peace. If we succeed, the world will find an excitement and accomplishment in peace beyond that which could ever be imagined through violence and war.

I want to leave you today with a message I have often spoken about to the citizens of my own country, especially in times when I have felt they were discouraged and unsure. I say it to you with as much hope and heart as I have said it to my own people. You have the right to dream great dreams. You have the right to seek a better world for your people. And all of us have the responsibility to work for that better world. And as caring, peaceful peoples, think what a powerful force for good we could be. Distinguished delegates, let us regain the dream the United Nations once dreamed. ■

○

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05706 1127